arXiv:1607.04009v2 [math.AP] 30 Jan 2017

INCOMPRESSIBLE IMMISCIBLE MULTIPHASE FLOWS IN POROUS MEDIA: A VARIATIONAL APPROACH

CLÉMENT CANCÈS, THOMAS O. GALLOUËT, AND LÉONARD MONSAINGEON

ABSTRACT. We describe the competitive motion of $(N+1)$ incompressible immiscible phases within a porous medium as the gradient flow of a singular energy in the space of non-negative measures with prescribed masses, endowed with some tensorial Wasserstein distance. We show the convergence of the approximation obtained by a minimization scheme *à la* [R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer & F. Otto, SIAM J. Math. Anal, 29(1):1–17, 1998]. This allow to obtain a new existence result for a physically well-established system of PDEs consisting in the Darcy-Muskat law for each phase, N capillary pressure relations, and a constraint on the volume occupied by the fluid. Our study does not require the introduction of any global or complementary pressure.

Keywords. Multiphase porous media flows, Wasserstein gradient flows, constrained parabolic system, minimizing movement scheme

AMS subjects classification. 35K65, 35A15, 49K20, 76S05

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Equations for multiphase flows in porous media 2
1.2. Wasserstein gradient flow of the energy 3
1.3. Minimizing movement scheme and main result 7
1.4. Goal and positioning of the paper 7
2. One-step regularity estimates 9
2.1. Energy and distance estimates 9
2.2. Flow interchange, entropy estimate and enhanced regularity 10
3. The Euler-Lagrange equations and pressure bounds 13
3.1. A decomposition result 14
3.2. The discrete capillary pressure law and pressure estimates 16
4. Convergence towards a weak solution 20
4.1. Time integrated estimates 20
4.2. Compactness of approximate solutions 21
4.3. Identification of the limit 22
Appendix A. A simple condition for the geodesic convexity of (Ω, d_i) 25
Appendix B. A multicomponent bathtub principle 26
Acknowledgements 30
References 30

1. Introduction

1.1. **Equations for multiphase flows in porous media.** We consider a convex open bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ representing a porous medium. $N+1$ incompressible and immiscible phases, labeled by subscripts $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ are supposed to flow within the pores. Let us present now some classical equations that describe the motion of such a mixture. The physical justification of these equations can be found for instance in [10, Chapter 5]. We denote by $s_i : \Omega \times (0,T) =: Q \to [0,1]$ the content of the phase i, i.e., the volume ratio of the phase i compared to all the phases and the solid matrix, and by $\boldsymbol{v}_i$ the filtration speed of the phase i. Then the conservation of the volume of each phase writes

$$\partial_t s_i + \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot (s_i \boldsymbol{v}_i) = 0 \quad \text{in } Q, \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \tag{1}$$

where $T > 0$ is an arbitrary finite time horizon. The filtration speed of each phase is assumed to be given by Darcy's law

$$\boldsymbol{v}_i = -\frac{1}{\mu_i} \mathbb{K} \left(\boldsymbol{\nabla} p_i - \rho_i \mathbf{g} \right) \quad \text{in } Q, \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}. \tag{2}$$

In the above relation, $\mathbf{g}$ is the gravity vector, μ_i denotes the constant viscosity of the phase i, p_i its pressure, and ρ_i its density. The intrinsic permeability tensor $\mathbb{K} : \overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is supposed to be smooth, symmetric $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}^T$, and uniformly positive definite: there exist $\kappa_\star, \kappa^\star > 0$ such that:

$$\kappa_\star |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 \leq \mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \boldsymbol{\xi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \leq \kappa^\star |\boldsymbol{\xi}|^2, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3}$$

The pore volume is supposed to be saturated by the fluid mixture

$$\sigma := \sum_{i=0}^{N} s_i = \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{a.e. in } Q, \tag{4}$$

where the porosity $\omega : \overline{\Omega} \to (0,1)$ of the surrounding porous matrix is assumed to be smooth. In particular, there exists $0 < \omega_\star \leq \omega^\star$ such that $\omega_\star \leq \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \omega^\star$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$. In what follows, we denote by $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_0, \dots, s_N)$, by

$$\Delta(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{s} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^{N+1} \,\middle|\, \sum_{i=0}^{N} s_i = \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \right\},$$

and by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{s} \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}) \,\middle|\, \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \Delta(\boldsymbol{x}) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \right\}.$$

There is an obvious one-to-one mapping between the sets $\Delta(\boldsymbol{x})$ and

$$\Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{s}^* = (s_1, \dots, s_N) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^N \,\middle|\, \sum_{i=1}^{N} s_i \leq \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \right\},$$

and consequently also between $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ and

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^* = \left\{ \boldsymbol{s}^* \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_+^{N}) \,\middle|\, \boldsymbol{s}^*(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x}) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \right\}.$$

In what follows, we denote by $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega}} \Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x}) \times \{\boldsymbol{x}\}$.

In order to close the system, we impose N capillary pressure relations

$$p_i - p_0 = \pi_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{a.e in } Q, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \tag{5}$$

where the capillary pressure functions $\pi_i : \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \to \mathbb{R}$ are assumed to be continuously differentiable and to derive from a strictly convex potential $\Pi : \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \to \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\pi_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s_i}(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) \qquad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

We assume that Π is uniformly convex w.r.t. its first variable. More precisely, we assume that there exist two positive constants $\varpi_\star$ and $\varpi^\star$ such that, for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$ and all $\boldsymbol{s}^*, \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^* \in \Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x})$, one has

$$\frac{\varpi^\star}{2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^* - \boldsymbol{s}^*|^2 \geq \Pi(\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) - \Pi(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) \cdot (\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^* - \boldsymbol{s}^*) \geq \frac{\varpi_\star}{2}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}^* - \boldsymbol{s}^*|^2, \tag{6}$$

where we introduced the notation

$$\boldsymbol{\pi} : \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \to \mathbb{R}^N \\ (\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) \mapsto \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) = (\pi_1(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}), \dots, \pi_N(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x})) \,. \end{cases}$$

The relation (6) implies that $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is monotone and injective w.r.t. its first variable. Denoting by

$$\boldsymbol{z} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\phi}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{x}) = (\phi_1(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{x}), \dots, \phi_N(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{x})) \in \Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x})$$

the inverse of $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{x})$, it follows from (6) that

$$0 < \frac{1}{\varpi^\star} \leq \mathbb{J}_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{\phi}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{x}) \leq \frac{1}{\varpi_\star} \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{\pi}(\Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{x}), \tag{7}$$

where $\mathbb{J}_{\boldsymbol{z}}$ stands for the Jacobian with respect to $\boldsymbol{z}$ and the above inequality should be understood in the sense of positive definite matrices. Moreover, due to the regularity of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ w.r.t. the space variable, there exists $M_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} > 0$ such that

$$|\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\phi}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{x})| \leq M_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega} \text{ and all } \boldsymbol{z} \in \boldsymbol{\pi}(\Delta^*(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{x}), \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ denote the gradient w.r.t. to the second variable only.

The problem is complemented with no-flux boundary conditions

$$\boldsymbol{v}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{n} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \tag{9}$$

and by the initial content profile $\boldsymbol{s}^0 = \left(s_0^0, \dots, s_N^0\right) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$:

$$s_i(\cdot, 0) = s_i^0 \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{N} s_i^0 = \omega \text{ a.e. in } \Omega. \tag{10}$$

Since we did not consider sources, and since we imposed no-flux boundary conditions, the volume of each phase is conserved along time

$$\int_\Omega s_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \int_\Omega s_i^0(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} =: m_i > 0, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}. \tag{11}$$

We can now give a proper definition of what we call a weak solution to the problem (1)–(2), (4)–(5), and (9)–(10).

Definition 1.1 (Weak solution)**.** *A measurable function $\boldsymbol{s} : Q \to (\mathbb{R}_+)^{N+1}$ is said to be a weak solution if $\boldsymbol{s} \in \Delta$ a.e. in Q, if there exists $\boldsymbol{p} = (p_0, \dots, p_N) \in L^2((0, T); H^1(\Omega))^{N+1}$ such that the relations (5) hold, and such that, for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T))$ and all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, one has*

$$\iint_Q s_i \partial_t \phi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t + \int_\Omega s_i^0 \phi(\cdot, 0) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \iint_Q \frac{s_i}{\mu_i} \mathbb{K} \left(\boldsymbol{\nabla} p_i - \rho_i \mathbf{g}\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \phi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t = 0. \tag{12}$$

1.2. **Wasserstein gradient flow of the energy.**

1.2.1. *Energy of a configuration.* First, we extend the convex function $\Pi : \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \to [0, +\infty]$, called *capillary energy density*, to a convex function (still denoted by) $\Pi : \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \times \overline{\Omega} \to [0, +\infty]$ by setting

$$\Pi(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{cases} \Pi\left(\omega \frac{\boldsymbol{s}^*}{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}\right) = \Pi\left(\omega \frac{s_1}{\sigma}, \dots, \omega \frac{s_N}{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{x}\right) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+ \text{ and } \sigma \leq \omega(\boldsymbol{x}), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

σ being defined by (4). The extension of Π by $+\infty$ where $\sigma > \omega$ is natural because of the incompressibility of the fluid mixture. The extension to $\{\sigma < \omega\} \cup \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+$ is designed so that the energy density only depends on the relative composition of the fluid mixture. However, this extension is somehow arbitrary, and, as it will appear in the sequel, it has no influence on the flow since the solution $\boldsymbol{s}$ remains in $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ (i-e $\sum_{i=0}^{N} s_i = \omega$). In our previous note [15] the appearance of void $\sigma < \omega$ was directly prohibited by a penalization in the energy.

The second part in the energy comes from the gravity. In order to lighten the notations, we introduce the functions

$$\Psi_i : \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\Omega} & \to & \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \boldsymbol{x} & \mapsto & -\rho_i \mathbf{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}, \end{array} \right. \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\},$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi} : \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\Omega} & \to & \mathbb{R}^{N+1}_+, \\ \boldsymbol{x} & \mapsto & (\Psi_0(\boldsymbol{x}), \dots, \Psi_N(\boldsymbol{x})) \,. \end{array} \right.$$

The fact that Ψ_i can be supposed to be positive come from the fact that Ω is bounded. Even though the physically relevant potentials are indeed the gravitational $\Psi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\rho_i \mathbf{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}$, the subsequent analysis allows for a broader class of external potentials and for the sake of generality we shall therefore consider arbitrary $\Psi_i \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega})$ in the sequel.

We can now define the convex energy functional $\mathcal{E} : L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N+1}) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by adding the capillary energy to the gravitational one:

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \int_\Omega \left(\Pi(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{s} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}\right) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \geq 0, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{s} \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N+1}). \tag{13}$$

Note moreover that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) < \infty$ iff $\boldsymbol{s} \geq 0$ and $\sigma \leq \omega$ a.e. in Ω. It follows from the mass conservation (11) that

$$\int_\Omega \sigma(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \sum_{i=0}^{N} m_i = \int_\Omega \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Assume that there exists a non-negligible subset A of Ω such that $\sigma < \omega$ on A, then necessarily, there must be a non-negligible subset B of Ω such that $\sigma > \omega$ so that the above equation holds, hence $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) = +\infty$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}. \tag{14}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{p} = (p_0, \dots, p_N) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ be such that $\boldsymbol{p} \in \partial_{\boldsymbol{s}} \Pi(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{x})$ for a.e. $\boldsymbol{x}$ in Ω, then, defining $h_i = p_i + \Psi_i(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and $\boldsymbol{h} = (h_i)_{0 \leq i \leq N}$, $\boldsymbol{h}$ belongs to the subdifferential $\partial_{\boldsymbol{s}} \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ of $\mathcal{E}$ at $\boldsymbol{s}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}) \geq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) + \sum_{i=0}^{N} \int_\Omega h_i(\widehat{s}_i - s_i) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \forall \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}} \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N+1}).$$

The reverse inclusion also holds, hence

$$\partial_{\boldsymbol{s}}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \left\{\boldsymbol{h} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \;\middle|\; h_i - \Psi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \partial_{\boldsymbol{s}}\Pi(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{x}) \text{ for a.e. } \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega\right\}. \tag{15}$$

Thanks to (14), we know that a configuration $\boldsymbol{s}$ has finite energy iff $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$. Since we are interested in finite energy configurations, it is relevant to consider the restriction of $\mathcal{E}$ to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$. Then using the one-to-one mapping between $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^*$, we define the energy of a configuration $\boldsymbol{s}^* \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^*$, that we denote by $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^*)$ by setting $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^*) = \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ where $\boldsymbol{s}$ is the unique element of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{s}^* \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^*$.

1.2.2. *Geometry of* Ω *and Wasserstein distance.* Inspired by the paper of Lisini [36], where heterogeneous anisotropic degenerate parabolic equations are studied from a variational point of view, we introduce $(N+1)$ distances on Ω that take into account the permeability of the porous medium and the phase viscosities. Given two points $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}$ in Ω, we denote by

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \left\{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in C^1([0,1];\Omega) \,\middle|\, \boldsymbol{\gamma}(0) = \boldsymbol{x} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\gamma}(1) = \boldsymbol{y}\right\}$$

the set of the smooth paths joining $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\boldsymbol{y}$, and we introduce distances d_i, $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ between elements on Ω by setting

$$d_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in P(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})} \left(\int_0^1 \mu_i \mathbb{K}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\tau))\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau) \cdot \boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau \right)^{1/2}, \qquad \forall (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in \overline{\Omega}. \tag{16}$$

It follows from (3) that

$$\sqrt{\frac{\mu_i}{\kappa^\star}} |\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}| \le d_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \le \sqrt{\frac{\mu_i}{\kappa_\star}} |\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}|, \qquad \forall (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in \overline{\Omega}^2. \tag{17}$$

For $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ we define

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \left\{ s_i \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}_+) \,\middle|\, \int_\Omega s_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = m_i \right\}.$$

Given $s_i, \widehat{s}_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$, the set of admissible transport plans between s_i and $\widehat{s}_i$ is given by

$$\Gamma_i(s_i, \widehat{s}_i) = \left\{ \theta_i \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega \times \Omega) \,\middle|\, \theta_i(\Omega \times \Omega) = m_i,\ \theta_i^{(1)} = s_i \text{ and } \theta_i^{(2)} = \widehat{s}_i \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega \times \Omega)$ stands for the set of Borel measures on $\Omega \times \Omega$ and $\theta_i^{(k)}$ is the k^{th} marginal of the measure θ_i. We define the quadratic Wasserstein distance W_i on $\mathcal{A}_i$ by setting

$$W_i(s_i, \widehat{s}_i) = \left(\inf_{\theta_i \in \Gamma(s_i, \widehat{s}_i)} \iint_{\Omega \times \Omega} d_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})^2 \mathrm{d}\theta_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \right)^{1/2}. \tag{18}$$

Due to the permeability tensor $\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x})$, the porous medium Ω might be heterogeneous and anisotropic. Therefore, some directions and areas might me privileged by the fluid motions. This is encoded in the distances d_i we put on Ω. Moreover, the more viscous the phase is, the more costly are its displacements, hence the μ_i in the definition (16) of d_i. But it follows from (17) that

$$\sqrt{\frac{\mu_i}{\kappa^\star}} W_{\text{ref}}(s_i, \widehat{s}_i) \le W_i(s_i, \widehat{s}_i) \le \sqrt{\frac{\mu_i}{\kappa_\star}} W_{\text{ref}}(s_i, \widehat{s}_i)., \qquad \forall s_i, \widehat{s}_i \in \mathcal{A}_i, \tag{19}$$

where W_{ref} denotes the classical quadratic Wasserstein distance defined by

$$W_{\mathrm{ref}}(s_i,\widehat{s}_i)=\left(\inf_{\theta_i\in\Gamma(s_i,\widehat{s}_i)}\iint_{\Omega\times\Omega}|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}|^2\mathrm{d}\theta_i(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\right)^{1/2}. \tag{20}$$

With the phase Wasserstein distances $(W_i)_{0\leq i\leq N}$ at hand, we can define the global Wasserstein distance $\boldsymbol{W}$ on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}:=\mathcal{A}_0\times\cdots\times\mathcal{A}_N$ by setting

$$\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{s},\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}})=\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N}W_i(s_i,\widehat{s}_i)^2\right)^{1/2},\quad\forall\boldsymbol{s},\widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Finally for technical reasons we also assume that there exist smooth extensions $\widetilde{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\widetilde{\omega}$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ of the tensor and the porosity, respectively, such that (3) holds on $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $\widetilde{\mathbb{K}}$, and such that $\tilde{\omega}$ is strictly bounded from below. This allows to define distances $\widetilde{d}_i$ on the whole $\mathbb{R}^d$by

$$\widetilde{d}_i(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})=\inf_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\widetilde{P}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}\left(\int_0^1\mu_i\widetilde{\mathbb{K}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\tau))\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau)\cdot\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau\right)^{1/2},\qquad\forall\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d \tag{21}$$

where $\widetilde{P}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})=\left\{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in C^1([0,1];\mathbb{R}^d)\,\middle|\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}(0)=\boldsymbol{x}\text{ and }\boldsymbol{\gamma}(1)=\boldsymbol{y}\right\}$. In the sequel, we assume that the extension $\widetilde{\mathbb{K}}$ of $\mathbb{K}$ is such that

$$\Omega\text{ is geodesically convex in }\mathcal{M}_i=(\mathbb{R}^d,\widetilde{d}_i)\text{ for all }i. \tag{22}$$

In particular $\widetilde{d}_i=d_i$ on $\Omega\times\Omega$. Since $\widetilde{\mathbb{K}}^{-1}$ is smooth, at least $C^2_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the Ricci curvature of the smooth complete Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{M}_i$ is uniformly bounded, i.e., there exists C depending only on $(\mu_i)_{0\leq i\leq N}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{K}}$ such that

$$|\mathrm{Ric}_{\mathcal{M}_i,\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{v})|\leq C\mu_i\mathbb{K}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{v},\qquad\forall\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d,\ \forall\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{23}$$

Combined with the assumptions on $\widetilde{\omega}$ we deduce that $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{\omega}}$ is $\widetilde{\lambda}_i$ displacement convex on $\mathcal{P}_2^{ac}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ for some $\widetilde{\lambda}_i\in\mathbb{R}$. Then (22) and mass scaling implies that $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ is λ_i displacement convex on $(\mathcal{A}_i,W_i)$ for some $\lambda_i\in\mathbb{R}$. We refer to [46, Chap. 14 & 17] for further details on the Ricci curvature and its links with optimal transportation.

In the homogeneous and isotropic case $\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x})=\mathrm{Id}$, Condition (22) simply amounts to assuming that Ω is convex. A simple sufficient condition implying (22) is given in Appendix A in the isotropic but heterogeneous case $\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x})=\kappa(\boldsymbol{x})\mathbb{I}_d$.

1.2.3. *Gradient flow of the energy.* The content of this section is formal. Our aim is to write the problem as a gradient flow, i.e.

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{s}}{\mathrm{d}t}\in-\mathbf{grad}_{\boldsymbol{W}}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})=-\left(\mathrm{grad}_{W_0}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}),\dots,\mathrm{grad}_{W_N}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})\right) \tag{24}$$

where $\mathbf{grad}_{\boldsymbol{W}}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ denotes the full Wasserstein gradient of $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$, and $\mathrm{grad}_{W_i}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ stands for the partial gradient of $s_i\mapsto\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ with respect to the Wasserstein distance W_i. The Wasserstein distance W_i was built so that $\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}=(\dot{s}_i)_i\in\mathbf{grad}_{\boldsymbol{W}}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ iff there exists $\boldsymbol{h}\in\partial_{\boldsymbol{s}}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ such that

$$\partial_t s_i=-\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\left(s_i\frac{\mathbb{K}}{\mu_i}\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_i\right),\qquad\forall i\in\{0,\dots,N\}.$$

Such a construction was already performed by Lisini in the case of a single equation. Owing to the definitions (13) and (15) of the energy $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$ and its subdifferential $\partial_{\boldsymbol{s}}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s})$, the partial differential equations can be (at least formally) recovered. This was roughly speaking to purpose of our note [15].

In order to define rigorously the gradient $\mathbf{grad}_{\boldsymbol{W}}\mathcal{E}$ in (24), $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ has to be a Riemannian manifold. The so-called Otto's calculus (see [42] and [46, Chapter 15]) allows to put a formal Riemannian structure on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$. But as far as we know, this structure cannot be made rigorous and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ is a mere metric space. This leads us to consider generalized gradient flows in metric spaces (cf. [5]). We won't go deep into details in this direction, but we will prove that weak solutions can be obtained as limits of a minimizing movement scheme presented in the next section. This characterizes the gradient flow structure of the problem.

1.3. **Minimizing movement scheme and main result.**

1.3.1. *The scheme and existence of a solution.* For a fixed time-step $\tau > 0$, the so-called minimizing movement scheme [24, 5] or JKO scheme [30] consists in computing recursively $(\boldsymbol{s}^n)_{n\geq 1}$ as the solution to the minimization problem

$$\boldsymbol{s}^n = \operatorname*{Argmin}_{\boldsymbol{s}\in\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}} \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})^2}{2\tau} + \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) \right), \tag{25}$$

the initial data $\boldsymbol{s}^0$ being given (10).

1.3.2. *Approximate solution and main result.* Anticipating that the JKO scheme (25) is well posed (this is the purpose of Proposition 2.1 below), we can now define the piecewise constant interpolation $\boldsymbol{s}^\tau \in L^\infty((0,T);\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}\cap\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}})$ by

$$\boldsymbol{s}^\tau(0,\cdot) = \boldsymbol{s}^0, \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{s}^\tau(t,\cdot) = \boldsymbol{s}^n \quad \forall t \in ((n-1)\tau, n\tau],\ \forall n \geq 1. \tag{26}$$

The main result of our paper is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be a sequence of time steps tending to 0, then there exists one weak solution $\boldsymbol{s}$ in the sense of Definition 1.1 such that, up to an unlabeled subsequence, $(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k})_{k\geq 1}$ converges a.e. in Q towards s as k tends to ∞.*

As a direct by-product of Theorem 1.2, the continuous problem admits (at least) one solution in the sense of Definition 1.1. As far as we know, this existence result is new.

Remark 1.3. *It is worth stressing that our final solution will satisfy* a posteriori *$\partial_t s_i \in L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)')$, $s_i \in L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega))$, and thus $s_i \in \mathcal{C}([0,T];L^2(\Omega))$. This regularity is enough to retrieve the so-called* Energy-Dissipation-Equality

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}(t)) = -\sum_{i=0}^{N}\int_\Omega \mathbb{K}\frac{s_i(t)}{\mu_i}\nabla(p_i(t)+\Psi_i)\cdot\nabla(p_i(t)+\Psi_i)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \leq 0 \quad \textit{for a.e. } t\in(0,T),$$

which is another admissible formulation of gradient flows in metric spaces [5].

1.4. **Goal and positioning of the paper.**

The aims of the paper are twofolds. First, we aim to provide rigorous foundations to the formal variational approach exposed in the authors' recent note [15]. This gives new insights into the modeling of complex porous media flows and their numerical approximation. Our approach appears to be very natural since only physically motivated quantities appear in the study. Indeed, we manage to avoid the introduction of the so-called Kirchhoff transform and global pressure, which classically appear in the mathematical study of multiphase flows in porous media (see for instance [18, 9, 20, 26, 27, 22, 19, 2, 3]).

Second, the existence result that we deduce from the convergence of the variational scheme is new as soon as there are at least three phases ($N \geq 2$). Indeed, since our study does not require the introduction of any global pressure, we get rid of many structural assumptions on the data among which the so-called *total differentiability condition*, see for instance Assumption **(H3)** in the paper by Fabrie and Saad [26]. This structural condition is not naturally satisfied by the models, and suitable algorithms have to be employed in order to adapt the data to this constraint [21]. However, our approach suffers from another technical difficulty: we are stuck to the case of linear relative permeabilities. The extension to the case of nonlinear concave relative permeabilities, i.e., where (1) is replaced by

$$\partial_t s_i + \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot (k_i(s_i)\boldsymbol{v}_i) = 0,$$

may be reachable thanks to the contributions of Dolbeault, Nazaret, and Savaré [25] (see also [48]), but we did not push in this direction since the relative permeabilities k_i are in general supposed to be convex in models coming from engineering.

Since the seminal paper of Jordan, Kinderlehrer, and Otto [30], gradient flows in metric spaces (and particularly in the space of probability measures endowed with the quadratic Wasserstein distance) were the object of many studies. Let us for instance refer to the monograph of Ambrosio, Gigli, and Savaré [5] and to Villani's book [46, Part II] for a complete overview. Applications are numerous. We refer for instance to [41] for an application to magnetic fluids, to [43, 7, 6] for applications to supra-conductivity, to [12, 11, 47] for applications to chemotaxis, to [37] for phase field models, to [39] for a macroscopic model of crowd motion, to [13] for an application to granular media, to [17] for aggregation equations, or to [31] for a model of ionic transport that applies in semi-conductors. In the context of porous media flows, this framework has been used by Otto [42] to study the asymptotic behavior of the porous medium equation, that is a simplified model for the filtration of a gas in a porous medium. The gradient flow approach in Wasserstein metric spaces was used more recently by Laurençot and Matioc [34] on a thin film approximation model for two-phase flows in porous media. Finally, let us mention that similar ideas were successfully applied for multicomponent systems, see e.g. [16, 32, 48, 49].

The variational structure of the system governing incompressible immiscible two-phase flows in porous media was recently depicted by the authors in their note [15]. Whereas the purpose of [15] is formal, our goal is here to give a rigorous foundation to the variational approach for complex flows in porous media. Finally, let us mention the work of Gigli and Otto [28] where it was noticed that multiphase linear transportation with saturation constraint (as we have here thanks to (1) and (4)) yields nonlinear transport with mobilities that appear naturally in the two-phase flow context.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we derive estimates on the solution $\boldsymbol{s}^\tau$ for a fixed τ. Beyond the classical energy and distance estimates detailed in §2.1, we obtain enhanced regularity estimates thanks to an adaptation of the so-called *flow interchange* technique of Matthes, McCann, and Savaré [38] to our inhomogeneous context in §2.2. Because of the constraint on the pore volume (4), the auxiliary flow we use is no longer the heat flow, and a drift term has to be added. An important effort is then done in §3 to derive the Euler-Lagrange equations that follow from the optimality of $\boldsymbol{s}^n$. Our proof is inspired from the work of

Maury, Roudneff-Chupin, and Santambrogio [39]. It relies on an intensive use of the dual characterization of the optimal transportation problem and the corresponding Kantorovitch potentials. However, additional difficulties arise from the multiphase aspect of our problem, in particular when there are at least three phases (i.e., $N \geq 2$). These are overpassed using a generalized multicomponent bathtub principle (Theorem B.1 in Appendix) and computing the associated Lagrange multipliers in §3.1. This key step then allows to define the notion of discrete phase and capillary pressures in §3.2. Then Section 4 is devoted to the convergence of the approximate solutions $(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k})_k$ towards a weak solution $\boldsymbol{s}$ as τ_k tends to 0. The estimates we obtained in Section 2 are integrated w.r.t. time in §4.1. In §4.2, we show that these estimates are sufficient to enforce the relative compactness of $(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k})_k$ in the strong $L^1(Q)^{N+1}$ topology. Finally, it is shown in §4.3 that any limit $\boldsymbol{s}$ of $(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k})_k$ is a weak solution in the sense of Definition 1.1.

2. One-step regularity estimates

The first thing to do is to show that the JKO scheme (25) is well-posed. This is the purpose of the following Proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $n \geq 1$ and $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$, then there exists a unique solution $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ to the scheme (25). Moreover, one has $\boldsymbol{s}^n \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Any $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ has finite energy thanks to (14). Let $(\boldsymbol{s}^{n,k})_k \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ be a minimizing sequence in (25). Testing $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}$ in (25) it is easy to see that $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n,k}) \leq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}) < \infty$ for large k, thus $(\boldsymbol{s}^{n,k})_k \subset \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ thanks to (14). Hence, one has $0 \leq s_i^{n,k}(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \omega(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all k. By Dunford-Pettis theorem, we can therefore assume that $s_i^{n,k} \rightharpoonup s_i^n$ weakly in $L^1(\Omega)$. It is then easy to check that the limit $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ of $\boldsymbol{s}^{n,k}$ belongs to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$. The lower semi-continuity of the Wasserstein distance with respect to weak L^1 convergence is well known (see, e.g., [44, Prop. 7.4]), and since the energy functional is convex thus l.s.c., we conclude that $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ is indeed a minimizer. Uniqueness follows from the strict convexity of the energy as well as from the convexity of the Wasserstein distances (w.r.t. linear interpolation $\boldsymbol{s}_\theta = (1-\theta)\boldsymbol{s}_0 + \theta \boldsymbol{s}_1$). □

The rest of this section is devoted to improving the regularity of the successive minimizers.

2.1. Energy and distance estimates.

Testing $\boldsymbol{s} = \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}$ in (25) we obtain

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})^2}{2\tau} + \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^n) \leq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}), \tag{27}$$

As a consequence we have the monotonicity

$$\ldots \leq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^n) \leq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}) \leq \ldots \leq \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^0) < \infty$$

at the discrete level, thus $\boldsymbol{s}^n \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ for all $n \geq 0$ thanks to (14). Summing (27) over n we also obtain the classical *total square distance* estimate

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{n \geq 0} \boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^{n+1}, \boldsymbol{s}^n) \leq 2\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^0) \leq C\left(\Omega, \Pi, \boldsymbol{\Psi}\right), \tag{28}$$

the last inequality coming from the fact that $\boldsymbol{s}^0$ is uniformly bounded since it belongs to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$, thus so is $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}^0)$. This readily gives the approximate 1/2-Hölder

estimate

$$\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n_1}, \boldsymbol{s}^{n_2}) \leq C\sqrt{|n_2 - n_1|\tau}. \tag{29}$$

2.2. **Flow interchange, entropy estimate and enhanced regularity.** The goal of this section is to obtain some additional Sobolev regularity on the capillary pressure field $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n*}, \boldsymbol{x})$, where $\boldsymbol{s}^{n*} = (s_1^n, \dots, s_N^n)$ is the unique element of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^*$ corresponding to the minimizer $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ of (25). In what follows, we denote by

$$\pi_i^n : \left\{ \begin{array}{ccll} \Omega & \to & \mathbb{R}, & \\ \boldsymbol{x} & \mapsto & \pi_i(\boldsymbol{s}^{n*}(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{x}), & \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \end{array} \right.$$

and $\boldsymbol{\pi}^n = (\pi_1^n, \dots, \pi_N^n)$. Bearing in mind that $\omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \geq \omega_\star > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$, we can define the relative Boltzmann entropy $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ with respect to ω by

$$\mathcal{H}_\omega(s) := \int_\Omega s(\boldsymbol{x}) \log\left(\frac{s(\boldsymbol{x})}{\omega(\boldsymbol{x})}\right) d\boldsymbol{x}, \quad \text{for all measurable } s : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Lemma 2.2. *There exists C depending only on $\Omega, \Pi, \omega, \mathbb{K}, (\mu_i)_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$ and all $\tau > 0$, one has*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} \|\nabla \pi_i^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^{N} \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right). \tag{30}$$

Proof. The argument relies on the *flow interchange* technique introduced by Matthes, McCann, and Savaré in [38]. Throughout the proof, C denotes a fluctuating constant that depends on the prescribed data $\Omega, \Pi, \omega, \mathbb{K}, (\mu_i)_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, but neither on t, τ, nor on n. For $i = 0 \dots N$ consider the auxiliary flows

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \partial_t \check{s}_i = \operatorname{div}(\mathbb{K}\nabla \check{s}_i - \check{s}_i \mathbb{K}\nabla \log \omega), & t > 0,\ \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega, \\ \mathbb{K}(\nabla \check{s}_i - \check{s}_i \nabla \log \omega) \cdot \nu = 0, & t > 0,\ \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Omega, \\ \check{s}_i|_{t=0} = s_i^n, & \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega \end{array} \right. \tag{31}$$

for each $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$. By standard parabolic theory (see for instance [33, Chapter III, Theorem 12.2]), these Initial-Boundary value problems are well-posed, and their solutions $\check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x})$ belong to $\mathcal{C}^{1,2}((0,1] \times \overline{\Omega}) \cap \mathcal{C}([0,1]; L^p(\Omega))$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ if $\omega \in \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\mathbb{K} \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Therefore, $t \mapsto \check{s}_i(\cdot, t)$ is absolutely continuous in $L^1(\Omega)$, thus in $\mathcal{A}_i$ endowed with the usual quadratic distance W_{ref} (20) thanks to [44, Prop. 7.4]. Because of (19), the curve $t \mapsto \check{s}_i(\cdot, t)$ is also absolutely continuous in $\mathcal{A}_i$ endowed with W_i.

From Lisini's results [36], we know that the evolution $t \mapsto \check{s}_i(\cdot, t)$ can be interpreted as the gradient flow of the relative Boltzmann functional $\frac{1}{\mu_i}\mathcal{H}_\omega$ with respect to the metric W_i, the scaling factor $\frac{1}{\mu_i}$ appearing due to the definition (18) of the distance W_i. As a consequence of (23), The Ricci curvature of (Ω, d_i) is bounded, hence bounded from below. Since $\omega \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and with our assumption (22) we also have that $\frac{1}{\mu_i}\mathcal{H}_\omega$ is λ_i-displacement convex with respect to W_i for some $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$ depending on ω and the geometry of (Ω, d_i), see [46, Chapter 14]. Therefore, we can use the so-called *Evolution Variational Inequality* characterization of gradient flows (see for instance [4, Definition 4.5]) centered at s_i^{n-1}, namely

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} W_i^2(\check{s}_i(t), s_i^{n-1}) + \frac{\lambda_i}{2} W_i^2(\check{s}_i(t), s_i^{n-1}) \leq \frac{1}{\mu_i}\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \frac{1}{\mu_i}\mathcal{H}_\omega(\check{s}_i(t)).$$

Denote by $\check{\boldsymbol{s}} = (\check{s}_0, \dots, \check{s}_N)$, and by $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^* = (\check{s}_1, \dots, \check{s}_N)$. Summing the previous inequality over $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ leads to

(32)
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\frac{1}{2\tau}\boldsymbol{W}^2(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t), \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})\right) \leq C\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t), \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(\check{s}_i(t))}{\tau}\right).$$

In order to estimate the internal energy contribution in (25), we first note that $\sum s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) = \omega(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$, thus by linearity of (31) and since ω is a stationary solution we have $\sum \check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \omega(\boldsymbol{x})$ as well. Moreover, the problem (31) is monotone, thus order preserving, and admits 0 as a subsolution. Hence $\check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \geq 0$, so that $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ is an admissible competitor in (25) for all $t > 0$. The smoothness of $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}$ for $t > 0$ allows to write

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\int_\Omega \Pi(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^*(\boldsymbol{x}, t), \boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_\Omega \check{\pi}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\partial_t \check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = I_1(t) + I_2(t), \tag{33}$$

where $\check{\pi}_i := \pi_i(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^*, \cdot)$, and where, for all $t > 0$, we have set

$$I_1(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_\Omega \boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\pi}_i(t) \cdot \mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{s}_i(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \quad I_2(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_\Omega \frac{\check{s}_i(t)}{\omega}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\pi}_i(t) \cdot \mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\omega\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

To estimate I_1, we first use the invertibility of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ to write

$$\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \boldsymbol{\phi}(\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t), \boldsymbol{x}) =: \check{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t),$$

yielding

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \mathbb{J}_{\boldsymbol{z}}\boldsymbol{\phi}(\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t), \boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\phi}(\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t), \boldsymbol{x}). \tag{34}$$

Combining (3), (7), (8) and the elementary inequality

$$ab \leq \delta\frac{a^2}{2} + \frac{b^2}{2\delta} \quad \text{with } \delta > 0 \text{ arbitrary}, \tag{35}$$

we get that for all $t > 0$, there holds

$$I_1(t) \leq -\frac{\kappa_\star}{\varpi^\star}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \kappa^\star\left(\delta\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \frac{1}{\delta}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\phi}(\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t))|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\right).$$

Choosing $\delta = \frac{\kappa_\star}{4\kappa^\star\varpi^\star}$, we get that

$$I_1(t) \leq -\frac{3\kappa_\star}{4\varpi^\star}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + C, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{36}$$

In order to estimate I_2, we use that $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ for all $t > 0$, so that $0 \leq \check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \leq \omega(\boldsymbol{x})$, hence we deduce that $\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\check{s}_i}{\omega}\right)^2 \leq 1$. Therefore, using (35) again, we get

$$I_2(t) \leq \delta\kappa^\star\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \frac{\kappa^\star}{\delta}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\omega|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Choosing again $\delta = \frac{\kappa_\star}{4\kappa^\star\varpi^\star}$ yields

$$I_2(t) \leq \frac{\kappa_\star}{4\varpi^\star}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + C. \tag{37}$$

Taking (36)–(37) into account in (33) provides

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\int_\Omega \Pi(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^*(\boldsymbol{x}, t), \boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\right) \leq -\frac{\kappa_\star}{2\varpi^\star}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + C, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{38}$$

Let us now focus on the potential (gravitational) energy. Since $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t)$ belongs to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $t > 0$, we can make use of the relation

$$\check{s}_0(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t), \qquad \text{for all } (\boldsymbol{x}, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+,$$

to write: for all $t > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N} \int_\Omega \check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\Psi_i(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega \check{s}_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t)(\Psi_i - \Psi_0)(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \int_\Omega \omega(\boldsymbol{x})\Psi_0(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

This leads to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N} \int_\Omega \check{s}_i(t)\Psi_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega (\Psi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) - \Psi_0(\boldsymbol{x}))\partial_t s_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = J_1(t) + J_2(t), \tag{39}$$

where, using the equations (31), we have set

$$J_1(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{\nabla}(\Psi_i - \Psi_0) \cdot \mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{s}_i(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x},$$

$$J_2(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega \frac{\check{s}_i(t)}{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nabla}(\Psi_i - \Psi_0) \cdot \mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\omega \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

The term J_1 can be estimated using (35). More precisely, for all $\delta > 0$, we have

$$J_1(t) \leq \kappa^\star \left(\delta \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^*(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\delta}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\nabla(\Psi_i - \Psi_0)\|_{L^2}^2\right). \tag{40}$$

Using (34) together with (7)–(8), we get that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^*\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{\varpi_\star}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\|_{L^2} + |\Omega| M_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^2 \leq \frac{2}{(\varpi_\star)^2}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\left(|\Omega| M_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^2.$$

Therefore, choosing $\delta = \frac{(\varpi_\star)^2 \kappa_\star}{8\kappa^\star \varpi^\star}$ in (40), we infer from the regularity of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ that

$$J_1(t) \leq \frac{\kappa_\star}{4\varpi^\star}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + C, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{41}$$

Finally, it follows from the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \check{s}_i \leq \omega$, from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and from the regularity of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}, \omega$ that

$$J_2(t) \geq -\kappa^\star \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Psi_i - \boldsymbol{\nabla}\Psi_0\|_{L^2} \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\omega\|_{L^2} = C. \tag{42}$$

Combining (39), (41), and (42) with (38), we get that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{E}(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t)) \leq -\frac{\kappa_\star}{4\varpi^\star}\int_\Omega |\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + C, \qquad \forall t > 0. \tag{43}$$

Denote by

$$\mathcal{F}_\tau^n(\boldsymbol{s}) := \frac{1}{2\tau}\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}) + \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) \tag{44}$$

the functional to be minimized in (25), then gathering (32) and (43) provides

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{F}_\tau^n(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t)) + \frac{\kappa_\star}{4\varpi^\star}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t), \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(\check{s}_i(t))}{\tau}\right) \qquad \forall t > 0.$$

Since $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(0) = \boldsymbol{s}^n$ is a minimizer of (25) we must have

$$0 \leq \limsup_{t\to 0^+}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{F}_\tau^n(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t))\right),$$

otherwise $\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t)$ would be a strictly better competitor than $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ for small $t > 0$. As a consequence, we get

$$\liminf_{t\to 0^+}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\limsup_{t\to 0^+}\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t), \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(\check{s}_i(t))}{\tau}\right).$$

Since $\check{s}_i$ belongs to $C([0,1]; L^p(\Omega))$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$ (see for instance [14]), the continuity of the Wasserstein distance and of the Boltzmann entropy with respect to strong L^p-convergence imply that

$$\boldsymbol{W}^2(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}(t), \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}) \underset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_\omega(\check{s}_i(t)) \underset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n).$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\liminf_{t\to 0^+}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right). \tag{45}$$

It follows from the regularity of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ that

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\check{\boldsymbol{s}}^*(t), \boldsymbol{x}) = \check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t) \underset{t\to 0^+}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{\pi}^n = \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^{n*}, \boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{in } L^p(\Omega).$$

Finally, let $(t_\ell)_{\ell\geq 1}$ be a decreasing sequence tending to 0 realizing the lim inf in (45), then the sequence $(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t_\ell))_{\ell\geq 1}$ converges weakly in $L^2(\Omega)^{N\times d}$ towards $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{\pi}^n$. The lower semi-continuity of the norm w.r.t. the weak convergence leads to

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\pi_i^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \lim_{\ell\to\infty}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t_\ell)\|_{L^2}^2 = \liminf_{t\to 0^+}\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\check{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leq C\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right)$$

and the proof is complete. □

3. The Euler-Lagrange equations and pressure bounds

The goal of this section is to extract informations coming from the optimality of $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ in the JKO minimization (25). The main difficulty consists in constructing the phase and capillary pressures from this optimality condition. Our proof is inspired from [39] and makes an extensive use of the Kantorovich potentials. Therefore, we first recall their definition and some useful properties. We refer to [44, §1.2] or [46, Chapter 5] for details.

Let $(\nu_1, \nu_2) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega)^2$ be two nonnegative measures with same total mass. A pair of Kantorovich potentials $(\varphi_i, \psi_i) \in L^1(\nu_1)\times L^1(\nu_2)$ associated to the measures

ν_1 and ν_2 and to the cost function $\frac{1}{2}d_i^2$ defined by (16), $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, is a solution of the Kantorovich *dual problem*

$$DP_i(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \max_{\substack{(\varphi_i, \psi_i) \in L^1(\nu_1) \times L^1(\nu_2) \\ \varphi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) + \psi_i(\boldsymbol{y}) \leq \frac{1}{2} d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})}} \int_\Omega \varphi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \nu_1(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \int_\Omega \psi_i(\boldsymbol{y}) \nu_2(\boldsymbol{y}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y}.$$

We will use the three following important properties of the Kantorovich potentials:

(a) There is always duality

$$DP_i(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \frac{1}{2} W_i^2(\nu_1, \nu_2), \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}.$$

(b) A pair of Kantorovich potentials (φ_i, ψ_i) is $\mathrm{d}\nu_1 \otimes \mathrm{d}\nu_2$ unique, up to additive constants.

(c) The Kantorovich potentials φ_i and ψ_i are $\frac{1}{2}d_i^2$-conjugate, that is

$$\varphi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \Omega} \frac{1}{2} d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) - \psi_i(\boldsymbol{y}), \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega,$$

$$\psi_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega} \frac{1}{2} d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) - \varphi_i(\boldsymbol{x}), \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{y} \in \Omega.$$

Remark 3.1. *Since Ω is bounded, the cost functions $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, are globally Lipschitz continuous, see (17). Thus item (c) shows that φ_i and ψ_i are also Lipschitz continuous.*

3.1. **A decomposition result.** The next lemma is an adaptation of [39, Lemma 3.1] to our framework. It essentially states that, since $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ is a minimizer of (25), it is also a minimizer of the linearized problem.

Lemma 3.2. *For $n \geq 1$ and $i = 0, \dots, N$ there exist some (backward, optimal) Kantorovich potentials φ_i^n from s_i^n to s_i^{n-1} such that, using the convention $\pi_0^n = \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s_0}(s_1^n, \dots, s_N^n, \boldsymbol{x}) = 0$, setting*

$$F_i^n := \frac{\varphi_i^n}{\tau} + \pi_i^n + \Psi_i, \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \tag{46}$$

and denoting $\mathbf{F}^n = (F_i^n)_{0 \leq i \leq N}$, there holds

$$\boldsymbol{s}^n \in \operatorname*{Argmin}_{\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}} \int_\Omega \mathbf{F}^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}. \tag{47}$$

Moreover, $F_i^n \in L^\infty \cap H^1(\Omega)$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$.

Proof. We assume first that $s_i^{n-1}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$ everywhere in Ω for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, so that the Kantorovich potentials (φ_i^n, ψ_i^n) from s_i^n to s_i^{n-1} are uniquely determined after normalizing $\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathrm{ref}}) = 0$ for some arbitrary point $\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathrm{ref}} \in \Omega$ (cf. [44, Proposition 7.18]). Given any $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_i)_{1 \leq 0 \leq N} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we define the perturbation

$$\boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon := (1 - \varepsilon)\boldsymbol{s}^n + \varepsilon \boldsymbol{s}.$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ is convex, thus $\boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon$ is an admissible competitor for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $(\varphi_i^\varepsilon, \psi_i^\varepsilon)$ be the unique Kantorovich potentials from s_i^ε to s_i^{n-1}, similarly normalized

as $\varphi_i^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{x}_{\rm ref}) = 0$. Then by characterization of the squared Wasserstein distance in terms of the dual Kantorovich problem we have

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2}W_i^2(s_i^\varepsilon, s_i^{n-1}) = \displaystyle\int_\Omega \varphi_i^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{x}) s_i^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \int_\Omega \psi_i^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{y}) s_i^{n-1}(\boldsymbol{y})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y}, \\ \dfrac{1}{2}W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1}) \geq \displaystyle\int_\Omega \varphi_i^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{x}) s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \int_\Omega \psi_i^\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{y}) s_i^{n-1}(\boldsymbol{y})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{y}. \end{cases}$$

By definition of the perturbation $\boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon$ it is easy to check that $s_i^\varepsilon - s_i^n = \varepsilon(s_i - s_i^n)$. Subtracting the previous inequalities we get

$$\frac{W_i^2(s_i^\varepsilon, s_i^{n-1}) - W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1})}{2\tau} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau}\int_\Omega \varphi_i^\varepsilon(s_i - s_i^n)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}. \tag{48}$$

Denote by $\boldsymbol{s}^{\varepsilon *} = (s_1^\varepsilon, \dots, s_N^\varepsilon)$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\varepsilon = \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^{\varepsilon *}, \cdot)$, and extend to the zero-th component $\overline{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^\varepsilon = (0, \boldsymbol{\pi}^\varepsilon)$. The convexity of Π as a function of $s_1, \dots, s_N$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \left(\Pi(\boldsymbol{s}^{n*}, \boldsymbol{x}) - \Pi(\boldsymbol{s}^{\varepsilon *}, \boldsymbol{x})\right)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} &\geq \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{\pi}^\varepsilon \cdot (\boldsymbol{s}^{n*} - \boldsymbol{s}^{\varepsilon *})\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \\ &= \int_\Omega \overline{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^\varepsilon \cdot (\boldsymbol{s}^n - \boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = -\varepsilon\int_\Omega \overline{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^\varepsilon \cdot (\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}^n)\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

For the potential energy, we obtain by linearity that

$$\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon - \boldsymbol{s}^n)\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \varepsilon\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}^n)\cdot\boldsymbol{\Psi}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}. \tag{50}$$

Summing (48)–(50), dividing by ε, and recalling that $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ minimizes the functional $\mathcal{F}_\tau^n$ defined by (44), we obtain

$$0 \leq \frac{\mathcal{F}_\tau^n(\boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon) - \mathcal{F}_\tau^n(\boldsymbol{s}^n)}{\varepsilon} \leq \sum_{i=0}^N \int_\Omega \left(\frac{\varphi_i^\varepsilon}{\tau} + \overline{\pi}_i^\varepsilon + \Psi_i\right)(s_i - s_i^n)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \tag{51}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Because Ω is bounded, any Kantorovich potential is globally Lipschitz with bounds uniform in ε (see for instance the proof of [44, Theorem 1.17]). Since $\boldsymbol{s}^\varepsilon$ converges uniformly towards $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ when ε tends to 0, we infer from [44, Theorem 1.52] that φ_i^ε converges uniformly towards φ_i^n as ε tends to 0, where φ_i^n is a Kantorovich potential form s_i^n to s_i^{n-1}. Moreover, since $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is uniformly continuous in $\boldsymbol{s}$, we also know that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\varepsilon$ converges uniformly towards $\boldsymbol{\pi}^n$ and thus the extension to the zero-th component $\overline{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^\varepsilon \to \overline{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^n = (0, \boldsymbol{\pi}^n)$ as well. Then we can pass to the limit in (51) and infer that

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega \mathbf{F}^n \cdot (\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}^n)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} \tag{52}$$

and (47) holds.

If $s_i^{n-1} > 0$ does not hold everywhere we argue by approximation. Running the flow (31) for a short time $\delta > 0$ starting from $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}$, we construct an approximation $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1,\delta} = (s_0^{n-1,\delta}, \dots, s_N^{n-1,\delta})$ converging to $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1} = (s_0^{n-1}, \dots, s_N^{n-1})$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ as δ tends to 0. By construction $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1,\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$, and it follows from the strong maximum principle that $s_i^{n-1,\delta} > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for all $\delta > 0$. By Proposition 2.1 there exists a unique minimizer $\boldsymbol{s}^{n,\delta}$ to the functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\tau^{n,\delta} : \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}_+ \\ \boldsymbol{s} \mapsto \frac{1}{2\tau}\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1,\delta}) + \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{s}) \end{cases}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1,\delta} > 0$, there exist unique Kantorovich potentials $(\varphi_i^{n,\delta}, \psi_i^{n,\delta})$ from $s_i^{n,\delta}$ to $s_i^{n-1,\delta}$. This allows to construct $\mathbf{F}^{n,\delta}$ using (46) where φ_i^n (resp. π_i^n) has been replaced by $\varphi_i^{n,\delta}$ (resp. $\pi_i^{n,\delta}$). Thanks to the above discussion,

$$0 \leq \int_\Omega \mathbf{F}^{n,\delta *} \cdot (\boldsymbol{s}^* - \boldsymbol{s}^{n,\delta *}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{s}^* \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^* \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^*. \tag{53}$$

We can now let δ tend to 0. Because of the time continuity of the solutions to (31), we know that $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1,\delta}$ converges towards $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. On the other hand, from the definition of $\boldsymbol{s}^{n,\delta}$ and Lemma 2.2 (in particular (30) with $s^{n-1,\delta}, s^{n,\delta}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{n,\delta}$ instead of $s^{n-1}, s^n, \boldsymbol{\pi}^n$) we see that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{n,\delta}$ is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)^{N+1}$ uniformly in $\delta > 0$. Using next the Lipschitz continuous (8) of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, one deduces that $\boldsymbol{s}^{n,\delta}$ is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\Omega)^{N+1}$. Then, thanks to Rellich's compactness theorem, we can assume that $\boldsymbol{s}^{n,\delta}$ converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)^{N+1}$ as δ tends to 0. By the strong convergence $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1,\delta} \to \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}$ and standard properties of the squared Wasserstein distance, one readily checks that $\mathcal{F}_\tau^{n,\delta}$ Γ-converges towards $\mathcal{F}_\tau^n$, and we can therefore identify the limit of $\boldsymbol{s}^{n,\delta}$ as the unique minimizer $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ of $\mathcal{F}_\tau^n$. Thanks to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we also infer that $\pi_i^{n,\delta}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ towards π_i^n. Using once again the stability of the Kantorovich potentials [44, Theorem 1.52], we know that $\varphi_i^{n,\delta}$ converges uniformly towards some Kantorovich potential φ_i^n. Then we can pass to the limit in (53) and claim that (52) is satisfied even when some coordinates of $\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1}$ vanish on some parts of Ω.

Finally, note that since the Kantorovich potentials φ_i^n are Lipschitz continuous and because $\pi_i^n \in H^1$ (cf. Lemma 2.2) and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is smooth, we have $F_i^n \in H^1$. Since the phases are bounded $0 \leq s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \omega(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is continuous we have $\boldsymbol{\pi}^n \in L^\infty$, thus $F_i^n \in L^\infty$ as well and the proof is complete. □

We can now suitably decompose the vector field $\mathbf{F}^n = (F_i^n)_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ defined by (46).

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\boldsymbol{F}^n = (F_0^n, \dots, F_N^n)$ be as in Lemma 3.2. There exists $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ such that, setting $\lambda^n(\boldsymbol{x}) := \min_j (F_j^n(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_j^n)$, there holds $\lambda^n \in H^1(\Omega)$ and*

$$F_i^n + \alpha_i^n = \lambda^n \ \ \mathrm{d}s_i^n - a.e.\ in\ \Omega, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \tag{54}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla} F_i^n = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \lambda^n \ \ \mathrm{d}s_i^n - a.e.\ in\ \Omega, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}. \tag{55}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 we know that $\boldsymbol{s}^n$ minimizes $\boldsymbol{s} \mapsto \int \boldsymbol{F}^n \cdot \boldsymbol{s}$ among all admissible $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$. Applying the multicomponent bathtub principle, Theorem B.1 in appendix, we infer that there exists $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n = (\alpha_0^n, \dots, \alpha_N^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ such that $F_i^n + \alpha_i^n = \lambda^n$ for $\mathrm{d}s_i^n$-a.e. $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ and $\lambda^n = \min_j (F_j^n + \alpha_j^n)$ as in our statement. Note first that $\lambda^n \in H^1(\Omega)$ as the minimum of finitely many H^1 functions $F_0, \dots, F_N \in H^1(\Omega)$. From the usual Serrin's chain rule we have moreover that

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla} \lambda^n = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \min_j (F_j^n + \alpha_j^n) = \boldsymbol{\nabla} F_i \cdot \chi_{[F_i^n + \alpha_i^n = \lambda^n]},$$

and since $s_i^n = 0$ inside $[F_i^n + \alpha_i^n \neq \lambda^n]$ the proof is complete. □

3.2. **The discrete capillary pressure law and pressure estimates.** In this section, some calculations in the Riemannian settings (Ω, d_i) will be carried out. In order to make them as readable as possible, we have to introduce a few basics. We refer to [46, Chapter 14] for a more detail presentation.

Let $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, then consider the Riemannian geometry (Ω, d_i), and let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$, then we denote by $g_{i,\boldsymbol{x}} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ the local metric tensor defined by

$$g_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{v}) = \mu_i \mathbb{K}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = \mathbb{G}_i(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

In this framework, the gradient $\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_i}\varphi$ of a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^1(\Omega)$ is defined by

$$\varphi(\boldsymbol{x} + h\boldsymbol{v}) = \varphi(\boldsymbol{x}) + h g_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}\left(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}}\varphi(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{v}\right) + o(h), \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1},\ \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega.$$

It is easy to check that this leads to the formula

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_i}\varphi = \frac{1}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi, \tag{56}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi$ stands for the usual (euclidean) gradient. The formula (56) can be extended to Lipschitz continuous functions φ thanks to Rademacher's theorem.

For φ belonging to $\mathcal{C}^2$, we can also define the Hessian $D^2_{g_i}\varphi$ of φ in the Riemannian setting by

$$g_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}\left(D^2_{g_i}\varphi(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{v}\right) = \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\varphi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t)\bigg|_{t=0}$$

for any geodesic $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_t = \exp_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}(t\boldsymbol{v})$ starting from $\boldsymbol{x}$ with initial speed $\boldsymbol{v} \in T_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}\Omega$.

Denote by φ_i^n the backward Kantorovich potential sending s_i^n to s_i^{n-1} associated to the cost $\frac{1}{2}d_i^2$. By the usual definition of the Wasserstein distance through the Monge problem, one has

$$W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1}) = \int_\Omega d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathbf{t}_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}))s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x},$$

where $\mathbf{t}_i^n$ denotes the optimal map sending s_i^n on s_i^{n-1}. It follows from [46, Theorem 10.41] that

$$\mathbf{t}_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) = \exp_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}\left(-\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_i}\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})\right), \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega. \tag{57}$$

Moreover, using the definition of the exponential and the relation (56), one gets that

$$d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \exp_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}\left(-\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_i}\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})\right) = g_{i,\boldsymbol{x}}\left(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_i}\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{\nabla}_{g_i}\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})\right) = \frac{1}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

This yields the formula

$$W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1}) = \int_\Omega \frac{s_i^n}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}. \tag{58}$$

We have now introduced the necessary material in order to reconstruct the phase and capillary pressures. This is the purpose of the following Proposition 3.4 and of then Corollary 3.5

Proposition 3.4. *For $n \geq 1$ let $\varphi_i^n : s_i^n \to s_i^{n-1}$ be the (backward) Kantorovich potentials from Lemma 3.2. There exists $\boldsymbol{h} = (h_0^n, \dots, h_N^n) \in H^1(\Omega)^{N+1}$ such that*

(i) $\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_i^n = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n}{\tau}$ *for* $\mathrm{d}s_i^n$*-a.e.* $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$

(ii) $h_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) - h_0^n(\boldsymbol{x}) = \pi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) + \Psi_i(\boldsymbol{x}) - \Psi_0(\boldsymbol{x})$ *for* $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$*-a.e.* $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

(iii) there exists C depending only on $\Omega, \Pi, \omega, \mathbb{K}, (\mu_i)_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$ and all $\tau > 0$, one has

$$\|\boldsymbol{h}^n\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)^{N+1}} \leq C\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2} + \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right).$$

Proof. Let φ_i^n be the Kantorovich potentials from Lemma 3.2 and $F_i^n \in L^\infty \cap H^1(\Omega)$ as in (46), as well as $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and $\lambda^n = \min_j (F_j^n + \alpha_j^n) \in L^\infty \cap H^1(\Omega)$ as in Corollary 3.3. Setting

$$h_i^n := -\frac{\varphi_i^n}{\tau} + F_i^n - \lambda^n, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\},$$

we have $h_i^n \in H^1(\Omega)$ as the sum of Lipschitz functions (the Kantorovich potentials φ_i^n) and H^1 functions F_i^n, λ^n. Recalling that we use the notation $\pi_0 = \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial s_0} = 0$, we see from the definition (46) of F_i^n that

(59)
$$h_i^n - h_0^n = \left(F_i^n - \frac{\varphi_i^n}{\tau}\right) - \left(F_0^n - \frac{\varphi_0^n}{\tau}\right) = (\pi_i^n + \Psi_i) - (\pi_0^n + \Psi_0) = \pi_i^n + \Psi_i - \Psi_0$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$-a.e. x, which is exactly our statement (ii).

For (i), we simply use (55) to compute

(60)
$$\boldsymbol{\nabla} h_i^n = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n}{\tau} + \boldsymbol{\nabla}(F_i^n - \lambda_i^n) = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_i^n}{\tau} \quad \text{for } \mathrm{d}s_i^n\text{-a.e. } \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}.$$

In order to establish now the H^1 estimate (iii), let us denote

$$\mathcal{U}_i = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega \;\middle|\; s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \geq \frac{\omega_\star}{N+1} \right\}.$$

Then since $\sum s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) = \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \geq \omega_\star > 0$, one gets that, up to a negligible set,

$$\bigcup_{i=0}^{N} \mathcal{U}_i = \Omega, \quad \text{hence} \quad (\mathcal{U}_i)^c \subset \bigcup_{j \neq i} \mathcal{U}_j. \tag{61}$$

We first estimate $\boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n$. To this end, we write

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_\star} \int_\Omega \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \leq A + B, \tag{62}$$

where we have set

$$A = \frac{1}{\kappa_\star} \int_{\mathcal{U}_0} \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad B = \frac{1}{\kappa_\star} \int_{(\mathcal{U}_0)^c} \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Owing to (60) one has $\boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\nabla}\varphi_0}{\tau}$ on $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \Omega$, where $s_0^n \geq \frac{\omega_\star}{N+1}$. Therefore,

$$A \leq \frac{(N+1)\mu_0}{\omega_\star \kappa_\star} \int_{\mathcal{U}_0} \frac{s_0^n}{\mu_0} \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_0^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \leq \frac{(N+1)\mu_0}{\tau^2 \omega_\star \kappa_\star} \int_\Omega \frac{s_0^n}{\mu_0} \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi_0^n \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi_0^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Then it results from formula (58) that

$$A \leq \frac{C}{\tau^2} W_0^2(s_0^n, s_0^{n-1}) \tag{63}$$

where C depends neither on n nor on τ. Combining (61) and (59), we infer

$$B \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_\star} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\mathcal{U}_i} \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{\nabla}[h_i^n - (\pi_i^n + \Psi_i - \Psi_0)] \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}[h_i^n - (\pi_i^n + \Psi_i - \Psi_0)] \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Using $(a+b+c)^2 \leq 3(a^2+b^2+c^2)$ and (3), we get that

$$B \leq \frac{3}{\kappa_\star}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_{\mathcal{U}_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_i\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \frac{3\kappa^\star}{\kappa_\star}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\pi_i^n\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\nabla}(\Psi_i-\Psi_0)\|_{L^2}^2\right). \tag{64}$$

Similar calculations to those carried out to estimate A yield

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_i\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \leq \frac{C}{\tau^2}W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1})$$

for some C depending neither on n, i nor on τ. Combining this inequality with Lemma 2.2 and the regularity of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, we get from (64) that

$$B \leq C\left(1+\frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n,\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2}+\sum_{i=0}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1})-\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right) \tag{65}$$

for some C not depending on n and τ (here we also used $1/\tau \leq 1/\tau^2$ for small τ in the W^2 terms). Gathering (63) and (65) in (62) provides

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_0^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\left(1+\frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n,\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2}+\sum_{i=0}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1})-\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right).$$

Note that (i)(ii) remain invariant under subtraction of the same constant $h_0^n, h_i^n \rightsquigarrow h_0^n - C, h_i^n - C$, as the gradients remain unchanged in (i) and only the differences $h_i^n - h_0^n$ appear in (ii) for $i \in \{1\dots N\}$. We can therefore assume without loss of generality that $\int_\Omega h_0^n \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = 0$. Hence by the Poincaré-Wirtinger inequality, we get that

$$\|h_0^n\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}h_0^n\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\left(1+\frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n,\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2}+\sum_{i=0}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1})-\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right).$$

Finally, from (ii) $h_i^n = h_0^n + \pi_i^n + \Psi_i - \Psi_0$, the smoothness of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, and using again the estimate (30) for $\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{\pi}^n\|_{L^2}^2$ we finally get that for all $i \in \{1,\dots,N\}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_i^n\|_{H^1}^2 &\leq C(\|h_0^n\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\pi_i^n\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\Psi_i\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\Psi_0\|_{H^1}^2)\\ &\leq C\left(1+\frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n,\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2}+\sum_{i=0}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1})-\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right),\end{aligned}$$

and the proof of Proposition 3.4 is complete. □

We can now define the phase pressures $(p_i^n)_{i=0,\dots,N}$ by setting

$$p_i^n := h_i^n - \Psi_i, \qquad \forall i \in \{0,\dots,N\}. \tag{66}$$

The following corollary is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 3.4 and of the regularity of Ψ_i.

Corollary 3.5. *The phase pressures $\boldsymbol{p}^n = (p_i^n)_{0\leq i\leq N} \in H^1(\Omega)^{N+1}$ satisfy*

$$\|\boldsymbol{p}^n\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq C\left(1+\frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n,\boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2}+\sum_{i=0}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1})-\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right) \tag{67}$$

for some C depending only on $\Omega, \Pi, \omega, \mathbb{K}, (\mu_i)_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ (but neither on n nor on τ), and the capillary pressure relations are fulfilled:

$$p_i^n - p_0^n = \pi_i^n, \qquad \forall i \in \{1,\dots,N\}. \tag{68}$$

Our next result is a first step towards the recovery of the PDEs.

Lemma 3.6. *There exists C depending depending only on $\Omega, \Pi, \omega, \mathbb{K}, (\mu_i)_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ (but neither on n nor on τ) such that, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ and all $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$, one has*

$$\left| \int_\Omega \left(s_i^n - s_i^{n-1}\right) \xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \tau \int_\Omega s_i^n \frac{\mathbb{K}}{\mu_i} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \left(p_i^n + \Psi_i\right) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \right| \leq C W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1}) \|D_{g_i}^2 \xi\|_\infty. \tag{69}$$

This is of course a discrete approximation to the continuity equation $\partial_t s_i = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot (s_i \frac{\mathbb{K}}{\mu_i} \boldsymbol{\nabla} (p_i + \Psi_i))$.

Proof. Let φ_i^n denote the (backward) optimal Kantorovich potential from Lemma 3.2 sending s_i^n to s_i^{n-1}, and let $\mathbf{t}_i^n$ be the corresponding optimal map as in (57). For fixed $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ let us first Taylor expand (in the g_i Riemannian framework)

$$\left| \xi(\mathbf{t}_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})) - \xi(\boldsymbol{x}) + \frac{1}{\mu_i} \mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) \boldsymbol{\nabla} \xi(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|D_{g_i}^2 \xi\|_\infty d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathbf{t}_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})).$$

Using the definition of the pushforward $s_i^{n-1} = \mathbf{t}_i^n \# s_i^n$, we then compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_\Omega (s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) - s_i^{n-1}(\boldsymbol{x})) \xi(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\mu_i} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \xi(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \right| \\
&\quad = \left| \int_\Omega (\xi(\boldsymbol{x}) - \xi(\mathbf{t}_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})) s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \int_\Omega \frac{\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\mu_i} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \xi(x) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \right| \\
&\quad \leq \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2} \|D_{g_i}^2 \xi\|_\infty d_i^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathbf{t}_i^n(\boldsymbol{x})) s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \frac{1}{2} \|D_{g_i}^2 \xi\|_\infty W_i^2(s_i^n, s_i^{n-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 3.4(i) we have $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi_i^n = -\tau \boldsymbol{\nabla} h_i^n$ for $\mathrm{d}s_i^n$ a.e. $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$, thus by the definition (66) of p_i^n, we get $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \varphi^n = -\tau \boldsymbol{\nabla} (p_i^n + \Psi_i)$. Substituting in the second integral of the left-hand side gives exactly (69) and the proof is complete. □

4. Convergence towards a weak solution

The goal is now to prove the convergence of the piecewise constant interpolated solutions $\boldsymbol{s}^\tau$, defined by (26), towards a weak solution $\boldsymbol{s}$ as $\tau \to 0$. Similarly, the τ superscript denotes the piecewise constant interpolation of any previous discrete quantity (e.g. $p_i^\tau(t)$ stands for the piecewise constant time interpolation of the discrete pressures p_i^n). In what follows, we will also use the notations $\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau *} = (s_1^\tau, \dots, s_N^\tau) \in L^\infty((0,T); \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}^*)$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau = \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau *}, \boldsymbol{x})$.

4.1. Time integrated estimates.

We immediately deduce from (29) that

$$\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{s}^\tau(t_2), \boldsymbol{s}^\tau(t_1)) \leq C |t_2 - t_1 + \tau|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \forall\, 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T. \tag{70}$$

From the total saturation $\sum_{i=0}^N s_i^n(\boldsymbol{x}) = \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \omega^\star$ and $s_i^\tau \geq 0$, we have the L^∞ estimates

$$0 \leq s_i^\tau(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \leq \omega^\star \quad \text{a.e. in } Q \text{ for all } i \in \{0, \dots, N\}. \tag{71}$$

Lemma 4.1. *There exists C depending only on $\Omega, T, \Pi, \omega, \mathbb{K}, (\mu_i)_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ such that*

$$\|\boldsymbol{p}^\tau\|_{L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^{N+1})}^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau\|_{L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^N)}^2 \leq C. \tag{72}$$

Proof. Summing (67) from $n=1$ to $n=N_\tau := \lceil T/\tau \rceil$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{p}^\tau\|^2_{L^2(H^1)} &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_\tau} \tau \|\boldsymbol{p}^n\|^2_{H^1} \\ &\le C \sum_{n=1}^{N_\tau} \tau \left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau^2} + \sum_{i=0}^{N_\tau} \frac{\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{n-1}) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^n)}{\tau}\right) \\ &\le C \left((T+1) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_\tau} \frac{\boldsymbol{W}^2(\boldsymbol{s}^n, \boldsymbol{s}^{n-1})}{\tau} + \sum_{i=0}^{N} \left(\mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^0) - \mathcal{H}_\omega(s_i^{N_\tau})\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

We use that

$$0 \ge \mathcal{H}_\omega(s) \ge -\frac{1}{e}\|\omega\|_{L^1} \ge -\frac{|\Omega|}{e}, \qquad \forall s \in L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ with } 0 \le s \le \omega$$

together with the total square distance estimate (28) to infer that $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|^2_{L^2(H^1)} \le C$. The proof is identical for the capillary pressure $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau$ (simply summing the one-step estimate from Lemma 2.2). □

4.2. **Compactness of approximate solutions.** We denote by $H' = H^1(\Omega)'$.

Lemma 4.2. *For each $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, there exists C depending only on Ω, Π, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, $\mathbb{K}$, and μ_i (but not on τ) such that*

$$\|s_i^\tau(t_2) - s_i^\tau(t_1)\|_{H'} \le C|t_2 - t_1 + \tau|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \forall\, 0 \le t_1 \le t_2 \le T.$$

Proof. Thanks to (71), we can apply [39, Lemma 3.4] to get

$$\left|\int_\Omega f\{s_i^\tau(t_2) - s_i^\tau(t_1)\}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\right| \le \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} W_{\mathrm{ref}}(s_i^\tau(t_1), s_i^\tau(t_2)), \qquad \forall f \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Thus by duality and thanks to the distance estimate (70) and to the lower bound in (19), we obtain that

$$\|s_i^\tau(t_2) - s_i^\tau(t_1)\|_{H'} \le W_{\mathrm{ref}}(s_i^\tau(t_1), s_i^\tau(t_2)) \le C W_i(s_i^\tau(t_1), s_i^\tau(t_2)) \le C|t_2 - t_1 + \tau|^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for some C depending only on Ω, Π, $(\rho_i)_i$, $\mathbf{g}$, $(\mu_i)_i$, $\mathbb{K}$. □

From the previous equi-continuity in time, we deduce full compactness of the capillary pressure:

Lemma 4.3. *The family $(\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau)_{\tau>0}$ is sequentially relatively compact in $L^2(Q)^N$.*

Proof. We use Alt & Luckhaus' trick [1] (an alternate solution would consist in slightly adapting the nonlinear time compactness results [40, 8] to our context). Let $h > 0$ be a small time shift, then by monotonicity and Lipschitz continuity of the capillary pressure function $\boldsymbol{\pi}(., \boldsymbol{x})$

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau(\cdot + h) - \boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2((0,T-h);L^2(\Omega)^N)} \\ &\quad\le \frac{1}{\kappa_\star}\int_0^{T-h}\int_\Omega (\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau(t+h,\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau(t,\boldsymbol{x}))\cdot(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau *}(t+h,\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{s}^{\tau *}(t,\boldsymbol{x}))\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad\le \frac{2\sqrt{T}}{\kappa_\star}\|\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau\|_{L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^N)}\|\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau *}(\cdot + h, \cdot) - \boldsymbol{s}^{\tau *}\|_{L^\infty((0,T-h);H')^N}.\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 that there exists $C > 0$, depending neither on h nor on τ, such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau(\cdot + h, \cdot) - \boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau\|_{L^2((0,T-h);L^2(\Omega)^N)} \leq C|h + \tau|^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand, the (uniform w.r.t. τ) $L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^N)$- and $L^\infty(Q)^N$-estimates on $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau$ ensure that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau(\cdot, \cdot + \boldsymbol{y})) - \boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \leq C\sqrt{|\boldsymbol{y}|}(1 + \sqrt{|\boldsymbol{y}|}), \qquad \forall\, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}^\tau$ is extended by 0 outside Ω. This allows to apply Kolmogorov's compactness theorem (see, for instance, [29]) and entails the desired relative compactness. □

4.3. **Identification of the limit.** In this section we prove our main Theorem 1.2, and the proof goes in two steps: we first retrieve strong convergence of the phase contents $\boldsymbol{s}^\tau \to \boldsymbol{s}$ and weak convergence of the pressures $\boldsymbol{p}^\tau \rightharpoonup \boldsymbol{p}$, and then use the strong-weak limit of products to show that the limit is a weak solution. All along this section, $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 1}$ denotes a sequence of times steps tending to 0 as $k \to \infty$.

Lemma 4.4. *There exist $\boldsymbol{s} \in L^\infty(Q)^{N+1}$ with $\boldsymbol{s}(\cdot,t) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ for a.e. $t \in (0,T)$, and $\boldsymbol{p} \in L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^{N+1})$ such that, up to an unlabeled subsequence, the following convergence properties hold:*

$$\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k} \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{s} \quad \text{a.e. in } Q, \tag{73}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\tau_k} \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \cdot) \quad \text{weakly in } L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^N), \tag{74}$$

$$\boldsymbol{p}^{\tau_k} \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{p} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)^{N+1}). \tag{75}$$

Moreover, the capillary pressure relations (5) hold.

Proof. From Lemma 4.3, we can assume that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\tau_k} \to \boldsymbol{z}$ strongly in $L^2(Q)^N$ for some limit $\boldsymbol{z}$, thus a.e. up to the extraction of an additional subsequence. Since $\boldsymbol{z} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\phi}(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{\pi}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{x})$ is continuous, we have that

$$\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k *} = \boldsymbol{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\tau_k}, \boldsymbol{x}) \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{\phi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{x}) =: \boldsymbol{s}^* \quad \text{a.e. in } Q.$$

In particular, this yields $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\tau_k} \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \cdot)$ a.e. in Q. Since we had the total saturation $\sum_{i=0}^{N} s_i^{\tau_k}(t,\boldsymbol{x}) = \omega(\boldsymbol{x})$, we conclude that the first component $i = 0$ converges pointwise as well. Therefore, (73) holds. Thanks to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, it is easy to check that $\boldsymbol{s}(\cdot,t) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ for a.e. $t \in (0,T)$. The convergences (74) and (75) are straightforward consequences of Lemma 4.1. Lastly, it follows from (68) that

$$p_i^{\tau_k} - p_0^{\tau_k} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k *}, \cdot), \qquad \forall i \in \{1,\dots,N\},\ \forall k \geq 1.$$

We can finally pass to the limit $k \to \infty$ in the above relation thanks to (74)–(75) and infer

$$p_i - p_0 = \boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{in } L^2((0,T);H^1(\Omega)), \qquad \forall i \in \{1,\dots,N\}.$$

which immediately implies (5) as claimed. □

Lemma 4.5. *Up to the extraction of an additional subsequence, the limit $\boldsymbol{s}$ of $(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k})_{k\geq 1}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}([0,T];\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}})$ where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ is equipped with the metric $\boldsymbol{W}$. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k}(t),\boldsymbol{s}(t)) \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ for all $t\in[0,T]$.*

Proof. It follows from the bounds (71) on s_i that for all $t\in[0,T]$, the sequence $(s_i^{\tau_k})_k$ is weakly compact in $L^1(\Omega)$. It is also compact in $\mathcal{A}_i$ equipped with the metric W_i due to the continuity of W_i with respect to the weak convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$ (this is for instance a consequence of [44, Theorem 5.10] together with the equivalence of W_i with W_{ref} stated in (19)). Thanks to (70), one has

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} W_i\left(s_i^{\tau_k}(t_2), s_i^{\tau_k}(t_1)\right) \leq |t_2-t_1|^{1/2}, \qquad \forall t_1,t_2\in[0,T].$$

Applying a refined version of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem [5, Prop. 3.3.1] then provides the desired result. □

In order to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2, it only remains to show that $\boldsymbol{s}=\lim \boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k}$ and $\boldsymbol{p}=\lim \boldsymbol{p}^{\tau_k}$ satisfy the weak formulation (12):

Proposition 4.6. *Let $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 1}$ be a sequence such that the convergences in Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 hold. Then the limit $\boldsymbol{s}$ of $(\boldsymbol{s}^{\tau_k})_{k\geq 1}$ is a weak solution in the sense of Definition 1.1 (with $-\rho_i\mathbf{g}$ replaced by $+\nabla\Psi_i$ in the general case).*

Proof. Let $0\leq t_1\leq t_2\leq T$, and denote $n_{j,k}=\left\lceil \frac{t_j}{\tau_k}\right\rceil$ and $\tilde{t}_j=n_{j,k}\tau_k$ for $j\in\{1,2\}$. Fixing an arbitrary $\xi\in\mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and summing (69) from $n=n_{1,k}+1$ to $n=n_{2,k}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}(76)\quad \int_\Omega (s_i^{\tau_k}(t_2)-s_i^{\tau_k}(t_1))\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} &= \sum_{n=n_{1,k}+1}^{n_{2,k}} \int_\Omega (s_i^n - s_i^{n-1})\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\\ &= -\int_{\tilde{t}_1}^{\tilde{t}_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i^{\tau_k}}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i^{\tau_k}+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=n_{1,k}+1}^{n_{2,k}} W_i^2(s_i^n,s_i^{n-1})\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $0\leq \tilde{t}_j - t_j\leq \tau_k$ and $\frac{s_i^{\tau_k}}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i^{\tau_k}+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(Q)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\tilde{t}_1}^{\tilde{t}_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i^{\tau_k}}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i^{\tau_k}+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t\\ &\qquad = \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i^{\tau_k}}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i^{\tau_k}+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\tau_k}).\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimate with the total square distance estimate (28) in (76), we obtain

$$(77)\quad \int_\Omega (s_i^{\tau_k}(t_2)-s_i^{\tau_k}(t_1))\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i^{\tau_k}}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i^{\tau_k}+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\tau_k}\right).$$

Thanks to Lemma 4.5, and since the convergence in $(\mathcal{A}_i,W_i)$ is equivalent to the narrow convergence of measures (i.e., the convergence in $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})'$, see for instance [44, Theorem 5.10]), we get that

$$(78)\qquad \int_\Omega (s_i^{\tau_k}(t_2)-s_i^{\tau_k}(t_1))\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \int_\Omega (s_i(t_2)-s_i(t_1))\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

Moreover, thanks to Lemma 4.4, one has

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i^{\tau_k}}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i^{\tau_k}+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t \underset{k\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t. \tag{79}$$

Gathering (77)–(79) yields, for all $\xi\in\mathcal{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ and all $0\le t_1\le t_2\le T$,

$$\int_\Omega (s_i(t_2)-s_i(t_1))\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}+\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int_\Omega \frac{s_i}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\xi \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t=0. \tag{80}$$

In order to conclude the proof, it remains to check that the formulation (80) is stronger the formulation (12). Let $\varepsilon>0$ be a time step (unrelated to that appearing in the minimization scheme (25)), and set $L_\varepsilon=\left\lfloor\frac{T}{\varepsilon}\right\rfloor$. Let $\phi\in\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,T))$, one sets $\phi_\ell=\phi(\cdot,\ell\varepsilon)$ for $\ell\in\{0,\dots,L_\varepsilon\}$. Since $t\mapsto\phi(\cdot,t)$ is compactly supported in $[0,T)$, then there exists $\varepsilon^\star>0$ such that $\phi_{L_\varepsilon}\equiv 0$ for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon^\star]$. Then define by

$$\phi^\varepsilon:\left\{\begin{array}{rcl}\overline{\Omega}\times[0,T] & \to & \mathbb{R}\\ (\boldsymbol{x},t) & \mapsto & \phi_\ell(\boldsymbol{x}) \quad \text{if } t\in[\ell\varepsilon,(\ell+1)\varepsilon).\end{array}\right.$$

Choose $t_1=\ell\varepsilon$, $t_2=(\ell+1)\varepsilon$, $\xi=\phi_\ell$ in (80) and sum over $\ell\in\{0,\dots,L_\varepsilon-1\}$. This provides

$$A(\varepsilon)+B(\varepsilon)=0,\qquad \forall\varepsilon>0. \tag{81}$$

where

$$A(\varepsilon)=\sum_{\ell=0}^{L_\varepsilon-1}\int_\Omega\left(s_i((\ell+1)\varepsilon)-s_i(\ell\varepsilon)\right)\phi^\ell\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x},$$
$$B(\varepsilon)=\iint_Q\frac{s_i}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\phi^\varepsilon\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t.$$

Due to the regularity of ϕ, $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\phi^\varepsilon$ converges uniformly towards ϕ as ε tends to 0, so that

$$B(\varepsilon)\underset{\varepsilon\to0}{\longrightarrow}\iint_Q\frac{s_i}{\mu_i}\mathbb{K}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\left(p_i+\Psi_i\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\phi\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t. \tag{82}$$

Reorganizing the first term and using that $\phi_{L_\varepsilon}\equiv0$, we get that

$$A(\varepsilon)=-\sum_{\ell=1}^{L_\varepsilon}\varepsilon\int_\Omega s_i(\ell\varepsilon)\frac{\phi_\ell-\phi_{\ell-1}}{\varepsilon}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}-\int_\Omega s_i^0\phi(\cdot,0)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}.$$

It follows from the continuity of $t\mapsto s_i(\cdot,t)$ in $\mathcal{A}_i$ equipped with W_i and from the uniform convergence of

$$(\boldsymbol{x},t)\mapsto\frac{\phi_\ell(\boldsymbol{x})-\phi_{\ell-1}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\varepsilon}\quad\text{if } t\in[(\ell-1)\varepsilon,\ell\varepsilon)$$

towards $\partial_t\phi$ that

$$A(\varepsilon)\underset{\varepsilon\to0}{\longrightarrow}-\iint_Q s_i\partial_t\phi\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}\mathrm{d}t-\int_\Omega s_i^0\phi(\cdot,0)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}. \tag{83}$$

Combining (81)–(83) shows that the weak formulation (12) is fulfilled. □

Appendix A. A simple condition for the geodesic convexity of (Ω, d_i)

The goal of this appendix is to provide a simple condition on the permeability tensor in order to ensure that Condition (22) is fulfilled. For the sake of simplicity, we only consider here the case of isotropic permeability tensors

$$\mathbb{K}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \kappa(\boldsymbol{x})\mathbb{I}_d, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega} \tag{84}$$

with $\kappa_\star \leq \kappa(\boldsymbol{x}) \leq \kappa^\star$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$. Let us stress that the condition we provide is not optimal.

As in the core of the paper, Ω denotes a convex open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with C^2 boundary $\partial\Omega$. For $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \partial\Omega$, we denote by $\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})$ the outward-pointing normal. Since $\partial\Omega$ is smooth, then there exists $\ell_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \partial\Omega) < \ell_0$, there exists a unique $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \partial\Omega) = |\boldsymbol{x} - \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}|$ (here dist denotes the usual Euclidian distance between sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$). As a consequence, one can rewrite $\boldsymbol{x} = \overline{\boldsymbol{x}} - \ell\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})$ for some $\ell \in (0, \ell_0)$.

In what follows, a function $f : \overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be normally nondecreasing (resp. nonincreasing) on a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ if there exists $\ell_1 \in (0, \ell_0]$ such that $\ell \mapsto f(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} - \ell\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}))$ is nonincreasing (resp. nondecreasing) on $[0, \ell_1]$.

Proposition A.1. *Assume that:*

(i) the permeability field $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \kappa(\boldsymbol{x})$ is normally non-increasing in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$;

(ii) for all $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \partial\Omega$, either $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})\cdot\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) < 0$, or $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})\cdot\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) = 0$ and $D^2\kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x})\cdot\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$.

Then there exists a C^2 extension $\widetilde{\kappa} : \mathbb{R}^d \to [\frac{\kappa_\star}{2}, \kappa^\star]$ of κ and a Riemannian metric

$$\widetilde{\delta}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \widetilde{P}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})} \left(\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widetilde{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\tau))} |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau)|^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \right)^{1/2}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{85}$$

with $\widetilde{P}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in C^1([0,1]; \mathbb{R}^d) \,\middle|\, \boldsymbol{\gamma}(0) = \boldsymbol{x} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\gamma}(1) = \boldsymbol{y} \right\}$, such that $(\Omega, \widetilde{\delta}_i)$ is geodesically convex.

Proof. Since Ω is convex, then for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$, there exists a unique $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \Omega) = |\boldsymbol{x} - \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}|$. Then one can extend κ in a C^2 way into the whole $\mathbb{R}^d$ by defining

$$\kappa(\boldsymbol{x}) = \kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) + |\boldsymbol{x} - \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) \cdot \boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) + \frac{|\boldsymbol{x} - \overline{\boldsymbol{x}}|^2}{2} D^2\kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}})\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) \cdot \boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}), \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega.$$

Thanks to Assumptions (i) and (ii), the function $\ell \mapsto \kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} - \ell\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}))$ is non-decreasing on $(-\infty, \ell_1]$ for all $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \partial\Omega$. Since $\partial\Omega$ is compact, there exists $\ell_2 > 0$ such that

$$\kappa(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} - \ell\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}) \geq \frac{\kappa_\star}{2}, \qquad \forall \ell \in (-\ell_2, 0].$$

Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-decreasing C^2 function such that $\rho(0) = 1$, $\rho'(0) = \rho''(0) = 0$ and $\rho(\ell) = 0$ for all $\ell \geq \ell_2$. Then define

$$\widetilde{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \rho(\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \Omega))\kappa(\boldsymbol{x}) + (1 - \rho(\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \Omega)))\frac{\kappa_\star}{2}, \qquad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

so that the function $\ell \mapsto \widetilde{\kappa}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}} - \ell\boldsymbol{n}(\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}))$ is non-increasing on $(-\infty, \ell_1)$ and bounded from below by $\frac{\kappa_\star}{2}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \Omega$, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \partial\Omega) \geq \varepsilon$, $\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{y}, \partial\Omega) \geq \varepsilon$, and κ is normally nonincreasing on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\Omega} \mid \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \partial\Omega) < \varepsilon\}$. A sufficient condition for $(\Omega, \widetilde{\delta})$ to be geodesic is that the geodesic $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathrm{opt}}_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}}$ from $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\boldsymbol{y}$ is such that

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathrm{opt}}_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}}(t), \partial\Omega\right) \geq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in [0,1]. \tag{86}$$

In order to ease the reading, we denote by $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathrm{opt}}_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}}$ any geodesic such that

$$\widetilde{\delta}^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widetilde{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\tau))} |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau)|^2 \mathrm{d}\tau. \tag{87}$$

We define the continuous and piecewise C^1 path $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\varepsilon$ from $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\boldsymbol{y}$ by setting

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\varepsilon(t) = \mathrm{proj}_{\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)), \qquad \forall t \in [0,1], \tag{88}$$

where $\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega \mid \operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \partial\Omega) \geq \varepsilon\}$ is convex, and the orthogonal (w.r.t. the euclidian distance dist) projection $\mathrm{proj}_{\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon}$ onto $\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ is therefore uniquely defined.

Assume that Condition (86) is violated. Then by continuity there exists a non-empty interval $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t), \partial\Omega) < \varepsilon, \qquad \forall t \in (a, b),$$

the geodesic between $\gamma(a)$ and $\gamma(b)$ coincides with the part of the geodesics between $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$. Then, changing $\boldsymbol{x}$ into $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(a)$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ into $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(b)$, we can assume without loss of generality that

$$\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t), \partial\Omega) < \varepsilon, \qquad \forall t \in (0, 1).$$

It is easy to verify that

$$|\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_\varepsilon(t)| \leq |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(t)|, \quad \forall t \in [0,1], \qquad \text{and} \quad |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_\varepsilon(t)| < |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(t)| \text{ on } (a,b) \tag{89}$$

for some non-empty interval $(a, b) \subset [0, 1]$. It follows from (85) that

$$\widetilde{\delta}^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widetilde{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\varepsilon(\tau))} |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_\varepsilon(\tau)|^2 \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Since κ is normally non-increasing, one has

$$\widetilde{\delta}^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widetilde{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\tau))} |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_\varepsilon(\tau)|^2 \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Thanks to (89), one obtains that

$$\widetilde{\delta}^2(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) < \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widetilde{\kappa}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\tau))} |\boldsymbol{\gamma}'(\tau)|^2 \mathrm{d}\tau,$$

providing a contradiction with the optimality (87) of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Thus Condition (86) holds, hence (Ω, δ) is a geodesic space. □

Appendix B. A multicomponent bathtub principle

The following theorem can be seen as a generalization of the classical scalar bathtub principle (see for instance [35, Theorem 1.14]). In what follows, N is a positive integer and Ω denotes an arbitrary measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem B.1. *Let $\omega \in L^1_+(\Omega)$, and let $\boldsymbol{m} = (m_0, \ldots, m_N) \in (\mathbb{R}^*_+)^{N+1}$ be such that $\sum_{i=0}^N m_i = \int_\Omega \omega \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$. We denote by*

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{s} = (s_0, \ldots, s_N) \in L^1_+(\Omega)^{N+1} \,\middle|\, \int_\Omega s_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = m_i \text{ and } \sum_{i=0}^N s_i = \omega \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \right\}.$$

Then for any $\boldsymbol{F} = (F_0, \dots, F_N) \in (L^\infty(\Omega))^{N+1}$*, the functional*

$$\mathcal{F} : \boldsymbol{s} \mapsto \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{F} \cdot \boldsymbol{s} \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$$

has a minimizer in $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$*. Moreover, there exists* $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ *such that, denoting*

$$\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) := \min_{0 \le j \le N} \{F_j(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_i\}, \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega,$$

any minimizer $\underline{\boldsymbol{s}} = (\underline{s}_0, \dots, \underline{s}_N)$ *satisfies*

$$F_i + \alpha_i = \lambda \qquad \mathrm{d}\underline{s}_i\text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}.$$

One can think of this as: $\underline{s}_i = 0$ in $\{F_i + \alpha_i > \lambda\}$ and $F_i + \alpha_i \ge \lambda$ everywhere, i.e., $\underline{s}_i > 0$ can only occur in the "contact set" $\left\{ \boldsymbol{x} \,\middle|\, F_i(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_i = \min_j (F_j(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_j) \right\}$.

Proof. For the existence part, note that $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous for the weak L^1 convergence, and that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ is weakly closed. Since $\sum s_i = \omega$ and $s_i \ge 0$ we have in particular $0 \le s_i \le \omega \in L^1$ for all i and $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$. This implies that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ is uniformly integrable, and since the mass $\|s_i\|_{L^1} = \int s_i = m_i$ is prescribed, the Dunford-Pettis theorem shows that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ is L^1-weakly relatively compact. Hence from any minimizing sequence we can extract a weakly-L^1 converging subsequence, and by weak L^1 continuity the weak limit is a minimizer.

Let us now introduce a dual problem: for fixed $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ we denote

$$\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \min_i \{F_i(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_i\} \tag{90}$$

and define

$$J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) := \int_\Omega \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_i m_i.$$

We shall prove below that

(i) $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is achieved,
(ii) $\min_{\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$.

The desired decomposition will then follow from equality conditions in (ii), and $\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ will be retrieved from any maximizer $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \operatorname{Argmax} J$.

Remark B.2. *The above dual problem can be guessed by introducing suitable Lagrange multipliers* $\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}), \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ *for the total saturation and mass constraints, respectively, and writing the convex indicator of the constraints as a supremum over these multipliers. Formally exchanging* $\inf \sup = \sup \inf$ *and computing the optimality conditions in the right-most infimum relates* λ *to* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ *as in* (90)*, which in turn yields exactly the duality* $\inf_{\boldsymbol{s}} \mathcal{F} = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} J$*. See also Remark B.3*

Let us first establish property (i). For all $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ and all $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$, we first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) &= \int_\Omega \min_j \{F_j(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_j\} \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_i m_i \\ &= \int_\Omega \min_j \{F_j(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_j\} \sum_{i=0}^N s_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \alpha_i \int_\Omega s_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^N \int_\Omega \left(\min_j \{F_j(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_j\} - \alpha_i \right) s_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \leq \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{F} \cdot \boldsymbol{s} \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{s}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular J is bounded from above and

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \leq \min_{\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{s}). \tag{91}$$

Since $\int \omega \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \sum m_i$, the function J is invariant under diagonal shifts, i.e., $J(\boldsymbol{\alpha} + c\mathbf{1}) = J(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ for any constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. As a consequence we can choose a maximizing sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k\}_{k \geq 1}$ such that $\min_j \alpha_j^k = 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. Let $j(k)$ be an index such that $\alpha_{j(k)}^k = \min_j \alpha_j^k = 0$. Then, since $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k$ is maximizing and $\omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \geq 0$, we get, for k large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup J - 1 \leq J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k) &= \int_\Omega \min_j \{F_j(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_j^k\} \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum \alpha_i^k m_i \\ &\leq \int_\Omega \big(F_{j(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \underbrace{\alpha_{j(k)}^k}_{=0}\big) \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum \alpha_i^k m_i \leq \|\boldsymbol{F}\|_{L^\infty} \|\omega\|_{L^1} - \sum \alpha_i^k m_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sum \alpha_i^k m_i \leq C$, and since $\alpha_i^k \geq 0$ and $m_i > 0$ we deduce that $\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k\right)_k$ is bounded. Hence, up to extraction of an unlabelled subsequence, we can assume that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^k$ converges towards some $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N+1}$. The map J is continuous, hence $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is a maximizer.

Let us now focus on property (ii). Note from (91) and (i) it suffices to prove the reverse inequality

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \geq \min_{\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{s}).$$

We show below that, for any maximizer $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ of J, we can always construct a suitable $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{s}) = J(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$. This will immediately imply the reverse inequality and thus our claim (ii). In order to do so, we first observe that J is concave, thus the optimality condition at $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ can be written in terms of superdifferentials as $\mathbf{0}_{\mathbb{R}^{N+1}} \in \partial J(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$. Denoting by

$$\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \int_\Omega \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \omega \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \int_\Omega \min_j \{F_j(x) + \alpha_j\} \omega(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$$

the first contribution in J, this optimality can be recast as

$$\boldsymbol{m} \in \partial \Lambda(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}). \tag{92}$$

For fixed $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$ and by usual properties of the min function, the superdifferential $\partial \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ of the concave map $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mapsto \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x})$ at $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ is characterized by

$$\partial \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N+1} \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=0}^N \theta_i = 1, \text{ and } \theta_i = 0 \text{ if } F_i(\boldsymbol{x}) + \alpha_i > \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right\}.$$

Therefore, it follows from the extension of the formula of differentiation under the integral to the non-smooth case (cf. [23, Theorem 2.7.2]) that

(93)
$$\partial\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N+1} \;\middle|\; \boldsymbol{w} = \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x})\omega(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \partial\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \right\}.$$

The optimality criterion (92) at any maximizer $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ gives the existence of some function $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as in (93) such that

$$m_i = \int_\Omega \theta_i(\boldsymbol{x})\omega(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}.$$

Defining

$$s_i(\boldsymbol{x}) := \theta_i(\boldsymbol{x})\omega(\boldsymbol{x}), \qquad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \tag{94}$$

we have by construction that $s_i \geq 0$, $\int s_i = m_i$, and $\sum s_i = (\sum_i \theta_i)\omega = \omega$ a.e, thus $\boldsymbol{s} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$. Exploiting again $\sum s_i = \omega$ as well as the crucial property that $\theta_i = 0$ a.e. in $\{\boldsymbol{x} \mid F_i + \overline{\alpha}_i > \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}\}$, or in other words that $F_i + \overline{\alpha}_i = \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}$ for $\mathrm{d}s_i$-a.e $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Omega$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} J(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) = \int_\Omega \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}\omega\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \overline{\alpha}_i m_i &= \sum_{i=0}^N \int_\Omega \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} s_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \overline{\alpha}_i m_i \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^N \int_\Omega (F_i + \overline{\alpha}_i) s_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{i=0}^N \overline{\alpha}_i m_i = \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{s}) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. Therefore $\boldsymbol{s}$ constructed by (94) is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}$ and

$$J(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) = \mathcal{F}(\underline{\boldsymbol{s}}). \tag{95}$$

In order to finally retrieve the desired decomposition, choose any minimizer $\underline{\boldsymbol{s}} \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} \cap \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ and any maximizer $\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ of J. Then it follows from (95) that

$$0 = \mathcal{F}(\underline{\boldsymbol{s}}) - J(\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) = \sum_{i=0}^N \int_\Omega F_i \underline{s}_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} - \int_\Omega \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}\omega\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \sum_{i=0}^N \overline{\alpha}_i m_i.$$

Using once again that $\int \underline{s}_i = m_i$ and $\sum_i \underline{s}_i = \omega$, we get that

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \int_\Omega (F_i + \overline{\alpha}_i - \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}})\, \underline{s}_i \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = 0.$$

By definition of $\lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}$ the above integrand is nonnegative, hence $F_i + \overline{\alpha}_i = \lambda_{\overline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}$ a.e. in $\{\underline{s}_i > 0\}$. □

Remark B.3. *To understand the dual problem one chan think the function F_i as $N+1$ bathub that can be translated vertically. The translation of each bathtub is given by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$. Once these translations are given one just wants to fill the bathubs starting from the bottom (that is $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$), while satisfying the global saturation and mass constraints. For an optimal translation vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, each phase i contributes at $\boldsymbol{x}$ with a ratio $\theta_i(\boldsymbol{x})$ as in (94).*

Acknowledgements. This project was supported by the ANR GEOPOR project (ANR-13-JS01-0007-01). CC also aknowledges the support of Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01). TOG was supported by the ANR ISOTACE project (ANR-12-MONU-0013). LM was supported by the Portuguese Science Fundation through FCT fellowship SFRH/BPD/88207/2012 and the UT Austin — Portugal CoLab project. Part of this work was carried out during the stay of CC and TOG at CAMGSD, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa. The authors whish to thank Quentin Mérigot for fruitful discussion.

References

[1] H. W. Alt and S. Luckhaus. Quasilinear elliptic-parabolic differential equations. *Math. Z.*, 183(3):311–341, 1983.

[2] B. Amaziane, M. Jurak, and A. Vrbaški. Existence for a global pressure formulation of water-gas flow in porous media. *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, 102:1–22, 2012.

[3] B. Amaziane, M. Jurak, and A. Žgaljić Keko. Modeling compositional compressible two-phase flow in porous media by the concept of the global pressure. *Comput. Geosci.*, 18(3-4):297–309, 2014.

[4] L. Ambrosio and N. Gigli. A user's guide to optimal transport. In *Modelling and optimisation of flows on networks*, volume 2062 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–155. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

[5] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.

[6] L. Ambrosio, E. Mainini, and S. Serfaty. Gradient flow of the Chapman-Rubinstein-Schatzman model for signed vortices. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 28(2):217–246, 2011.

[7] L. Ambrosio and S. Serfaty. A gradient flow approach to an evolution problem arising in superconductivity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(11):1495–1539, 2008.

[8] B. Andreianov, C. Cancès, and A. Moussa. A nonlinear time compactness result and applications to discretization of degenerate parabolic-elliptic PDEs. HAL: hal-01142499, 2015.

[9] S. N. Antoncev and V. N. Monahov. Three-dimensional problems of transient two-phase filtration in inhomogeneous anisotropic porous media. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 243(3):553–556, 1978.

[10] J. Bear and Y. Bachmat. *Introduction to modeling of transport phenomena in porous media*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1990.

[11] A. Blanchet. A gradient flow approach to the Keller-Segel systems. RIMS Kokyuroku's lecture notes, 2014.

[12] A. Blanchet, V. Calvez, and J. A. Carrillo. Convergence of the mass-transport steepest descent scheme for the subcritical Patlak-Keller-Segel model. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(2):691–721, 2008.

[13] F. Bolley, I. Gentil, and A. Guillin. Uniform convergence to equilibrium for granular media. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 208(2):429–445, 2013.

[14] C. Cancès and T. Gallouët. On the time continuity of entropy solutions. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 11(1):43–55, 2011.

[15] C. Cancès, T. O. Gallouët, and L. Monsaingeon. The gradient flow structure of immiscible incompressible two-phase flows in porous media. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 353:985–989, 2015.

[16] G. Carlier and M. Laborde. On systems of continuity equations with nonlinear diffusion and nonlocal drifts. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1505.01304, 2015.

[17] J. A. Carrillo, M. DiFrancesco, A. Figalli, T. Laurent, and D. Slepčev. Global-in-time weak measure solutions and finite-time aggregation for nonlocal interaction equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 156(2):229–271, 2011.

[18] G. Chavent. A new formulation of diphasic incompressible flows in porous media. In *Applications of methods of functional analysis to problems in mechanics (Joint Sympos., IUTAM/IMU, Marseille, 1975)*, pages 258–270. Lecture Notes in Math., 503. Springer, Berlin, 1976.

[19] G. Chavent. A fully equivalent global pressure formulation for three-phases compressible flows. *Appl. Anal.*, 88(10-11):1527–1541, 2009.
[20] G. Chavent and J. Jaffré. *Mathematical Models and Finite Elements for Reservoir Simulation*, volume 17. North-Holland, Amsterdam, stud. math. appl. edition, 1986.
[21] G. Chavent and G. Salzano. Un algorithme pour la détermination de perméabilités relatives triphasiques satisfaisant une condition de différentielle totale. Technical Report 355, INRIA, 1985.
[22] Z. Chen. Degenerate two-phase incompressible flow. I. Existence, uniqueness and regularity of a weak solution. *J. Differential Equations*, 171(2):203–232, 2001.
[23] F. H. Clarke *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*. Classics in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 1990.
[24] E. De Giorgi. New problems on minimizing movements. In *Boundary value problems for partial differential equations and applications*, volume 29 of *RMA Res. Notes Appl. Math.*, pages 81–98. Masson, Paris, 1993.
[25] J. Dolbeault, B. Nazaret, and G. Savaré. A new class of transport distances between measures. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 34(2):193–231, 2009.
[26] P. Fabrie and M. Saad. Existence de solutions faibles pour un modèle d'écoulement triphasique en milieu poreux. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 2(3):337–373, 1993.
[27] G. Gagneux and M. Madaune-Tort. *Analyse mathématique de modèles non linéaires de l'ingénierie pétrolière*, volume 22 of *Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996. With a preface by Charles-Michel Marle.
[28] N. Gigli and F. Otto. Entropic Burgersd5 equation via a minimizing movement scheme based on the Wasserstein metric. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 47(1-2):181–206, 2013.
[29] H. Hance-Olsen and H. Holden. The Kolmogorov-Riesz compactness theorem. *Expo. Math.*, 28:385–394, 2010.
[30] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
[31] D. Kinderlehrer, L. Monsaingeon, and X. Xu. A Wasserstein gradient flow approach to Poisson-Nernst-Planck equations. *ESAIM: Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 23(1):137–164, 2017.
[32] M. Laborde. Systèmes de particules en interaction, approche par flot de gradient dans l'espace de Wasserstein. *Ph.D thesis*, Université Paris-Dauphine, 2016.
[33] O. A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Solonnikov, and N. N. Ural′ceva. *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*. Translated from the Russian by S. Smith. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 23. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1968.
[34] P. Laurençot and B.-V. Matioc. A gradient flow approach to a thin film approximation of the muskat problem. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 47((1-2)):319–341, 2013.
[35] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss. *Analysis*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2001.
[36] S. Lisini. Nonlinear diffusion equations with variable coefficients as gradient flows in Wasserstein spaces. *ESAIM: Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 15(3):712–740, 2009.
[37] S. Lisini, D. Matthes, and G. Savaré. Cahn-Hilliard and thin film equations with nonlinear mobility as gradient flows in weighted-Wasserstein metrics. *J. Differential Equations*, 253(2):814–850, 2012.
[38] D. Matthes, R. J. McCann, and G. Savaré. A family of nonlinear fourth order equations of gradient flow type. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 34(11):1352–1397, 2009.
[39] B. Maury, A. Roudneff-Chupin, and F. Santambrogio. A macroscopic crowd motion model of gradient flow type. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 20(10):1787–1821, 2010.
[40] A. Moussa. Some variants of the classical Aubin-Lions Lemma. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 16(1):65–93, 2016.
[41] F. Otto. Dynamics of labyrinthine pattern formation in magnetic fluids: a mean-field theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 141(1):63–103, 1998.
[42] F. Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 26(1-2):101–174, 2001.
[43] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. Gamma-convergence of gradient flows with applications to Ginzburg-Landau. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 57(12):1627–1672, 2004.
[44] F. Santambrogio. *Optimal Transport for Applied Mathematicians: Calculus of Variations, PDEs, and Modeling*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications 87. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1 edition, 2015.

[45] S. Simons. *Minimax and monotonicity*, volume 1693 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
[46] C. Villani. *Optimal transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.
[47] J. Zinsl and D. Matthes. Exponential convergence to equilibrium in a coupled gradient flow system modeling chemotaxis. *Anal. PDE*, 8(2):425–466, 2015.
[48] J. Zinsl and D. Matthes. Transport distances and geodesic convexity for systems of degenerate diffusion equations *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 54(4):3397–2438, 2015.
[49] J. Zinsl Existence of solutions for a nonlinear system of parabolic equations with gradient flow structure *Monatsh. Math.*, 174(4):653–679, 2014.

Clément Cancès (clement.cances@inria.fr). Team RAPSODI, Inria Lille – Nord Europe, 40 av. Halley, F-59650 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France.

Thomas O. Gallouët (thomas.gallouet@ulg.ac.be). Département de mathématiques, Université de Liège, Allée de la découverte 12, B-4000 Liège, Belgique.

Léonard Monsaingeon (leonard.monsaingeon@univ-lorraine.fr). Institut Élie Cartan de Lorraine, Université de Lorraine, Site de Nancy B.P. 70239, F-54506 Vandoeuvre-lèss-Nancy Cedex